UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

64 Parliamentary Papers
Reference Only

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

620170

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_august-05-september-09-1886_308

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

49° & 50° VICTORIÆ, 1886.

VOL. CCCVIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE FIFTH DAY OF AUGUST 1886,

TO

THE NINTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1886.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 2.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK & SON,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1886.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCCVIII.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5.

Page

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The PARLIAMENT opened by Commission.

ROLL OF THE LORDS—

Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Certificate of the Election of Sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland—*Delivered*, and read 3

[2.30.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5.

A Book containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament delivered to Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave, Esquire, by Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Great Britain 4

Message from The LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went up to the House of Peers; and being returned—The House proceeded to the—

ELECTION OF A SPEAKER—

The Right Honourable ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL unanimously called to the Chair 4

[2.45.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 6.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION—SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, PRESENTED AND APPROVED 12

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

SAT FIRST 14

[4.45.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 6.

Page

Mr. Speaker *reported* Her Majesty's Approval, and took and subscribed the Oath 15

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported*, That the Lords Commissioners under the Great Seal for opening and holding this Parliament, had made a Communication to both Houses, which Mr. Speaker read to the House .. 16

ELECTIONS 16

NEW WRITS 17

[4.45.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 9.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath required by Law.

DOUBLE RETURN—COUNTY OF EDINBURGH (MIDLOTHIAN) AND BOROUGH OF LEITH—

Letter received by Mr. Speaker from the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, electing to serve for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian) 19

NEW WRITS 19

[4.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 10.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath required by Law.

NEW WRITS 20

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Thursday 19th August. [4.0.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 19.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech *delivered* by The LORD CHANCELLOR 20

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND—MINUTES OF MEETING 21

NEW PEERS 22

Select Vestries—

Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) .. 22

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by The LORD CHANCELLOR;—An Address to HER MAJESTY thereon *moved* by *The Earl of Onslow*—(the Motion being *seconded* by *The Lord De Ros*) 22

After debate, Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—The Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

[*August* 19.] Page

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES—*appointed.*

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS—*appointed.*

APPEAL COMMITTEE—*appointed.* [8.0.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 19.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS ;

The House went;—and being returned;—

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN 71

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one other Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW WRIT ISSUED FOR KING'S LYNN 72

ELECTIONS—RESOLUTION 73

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—SESSIONAL ORDERS—INTERFERENCE OF PEERS IN ELECTIONS—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom, for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected ; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament" 73

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 294, Noes 126; Majority 168.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

PRIVILEGES—*Ordered,* That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

Outlawries Bill—

Bill, "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

NOTICE.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Notice of Motion, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 89

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — DURATION OF THE SESSION—Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 89

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—ADDITIONAL MEMBERS—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John Morley; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 90

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—VOTES IN SUPPLY—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 91

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by Mr. SPEAKER;—An humble Address thereon *moved* by *Colonel King-Harman*—(The Motion being *seconded* by *Mr. J. M. Maclean*) 91

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.* [12.0.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 20.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

QUESTIONS.

ARMY—ARTILLERY—COMPLAINTS AS TO QUALITY OF FIELD OR MOUNTAIN GUNS—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 158

ARMY — CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT — Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 159

PARLIAMENT — THE COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE — Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 159

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—THE HESSIAN FLY—Question, Mr. Herbert Gardner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 159

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—SHELTER IN PALACE YARD—Question, Mr. W. Beckett; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 160

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTES—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 160

TRUCK ACTS—THE EASDALE SLATE COMPANY—Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 161

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL—LICENCES FOR SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 161

NAVY—H.M.S. "IMPERIEUSE"—Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 162

NAVY — ORDNANCE — THE 38-TON GUNS OF H.M.S. "AJAX" — Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 163

POOR LAW—FLOGGING AT THE HANWELL PAUPER SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 164

GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND — LAW ADVISER TO THE LORD LIEUTENANT — Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 164

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT BELFAST — THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John Morley; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 165

RUSSIA—RUMOURED OCCUPATION OF PORT LAZAREFF—Question, Mr. Seager-Hunt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 166

[*August* 20.] Page

Army—Manufacture of Arms, Ammunition, &c.—Question, Major-General Goldsworthy; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 166

Business of the House — Bills of Private Members — Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 166

MOTION.

New Writ—Double Return for Belfast Borough (Western Division) and Sligo County (Southern Division) — Motion, Mr. Biggar; Observations, Mr. Speaker; Questions, Mr. Sexton, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Speaker 168

Business of the House — Hours of Commencement — Observation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) .. 169

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—[Adjourned Debate] [Second Night]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August:] —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 170

After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Labouchere*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

Rivers Pollution (River Lea)—

Moved, "That the Select Committee of the last Parliament 'to inquire into and report upon the condition of the River Lea, and to make such recommendations as may appear necessary,' be re-appointed,"—(*Sir Charles Russell*) 249

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Town Holdings—

Moved, "That the Select Committee of last Parliament be re-appointed to inquire into the terms of occupation and the compensation for improvements possessed by the occupiers of town houses and holdings in Great Britain and Ireland; and to inquire into the expediency of giving to leaseholders facilities for the purchase of the fee simple of their property; and also into the question of imposing a direct assessment on the owners of ground rents, and on the owners of increased values imparted to land by building operations, or other improvements,"—(*Colonel Nolan*) .. 249

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*

Adjournment—

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till *Monday* next,—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Luke Hayden, Mr. E. Harrington, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Connolly*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 1] 250

Employers' Liability Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Nolan, Mr. Burt, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 2] 251

National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. Conway, Mr. Joseph Nolan, Mr. Sheehy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 3] 251

Mining Royalties Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Clancy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 4] .. 251

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Mahony, Mr. Chance, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Carew*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 5] 251

[*August* 20.] Page

Sites for Churches, &c. (Ireland Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Thomas Mayne, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Crilly*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 6] 251

Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Molloy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 7] 251

Returning Officers' Expenses Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Picton, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Caine, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. Burt, Mr. James Stuart*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 8] 251

Bankruptcy Court (Belfast) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. Biggar, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Carew*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 9] 251

Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. M'Cartan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 10] 252

Arbitration Courts (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mason, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, Mr. Watt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 11] .. 252

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Acland, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Bickford-Smith*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 12] 252

Butter Substitutes Bill — *Considered* in Committee: — Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*: — Bill *ordered* (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Lalor, Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. Hooper, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Biggar, Dr. Tanner*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 13] 252

High Sheriff (Disqualification Removal) (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Alderman John O'Connor* (*Kerry, S.*), *Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. Cox, Mr. Richard Power*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 14] 252

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 15] .. 252

Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Deasy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 16] 253

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lockwood*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 17] 253

Miners' Wages Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Clancy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 18] 253

[12.30.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 23.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

NOTICE.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—THE TITHE WAR IN WALES — Notice of Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard 254

QUESTIONS.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) — DREDGING FOR MUSSELS IN DORNOCH FIRTH—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 254

[*August* 23.]

Page

NAVY — ORDNANCE — THE "COLLINGWOOD" 42-TON GUN—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 254

ARMY—COMMISSIONS IN THE ROYAL ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 255

MERCHANT SHIPPING — FISHING BOATS ACTS AMENDMENT — LEGISLATION—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) 255

ARMY — CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT — Questions, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Sir William Crossman, Mr. E. Robertson; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 256

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS—REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE—Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 257

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE VOLUNTEERS—THE CAPITATION GRANT—Question, Viscount Wolmer; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 257

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTION OF JOHN COX, SIGNALMAN ON THE SOMERSET AND DORSET RAILWAY—Question, Mr. E. R. Russell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 257

COAL MINES—THE WOODEND COLLIERY EXPLOSION — Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 258

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — THE CAVAN MILITIA — LIEUTENANT W. H. MALCOLMSON—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 260

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) — MR. C. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE—Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 260

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — THE CAVAN MILITIA — CAPTAIN SOMERSET MAXWELL—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 261

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE CAVAN MILITIA—COLONEL DEASE—MAJOR KERR—Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 261

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PASSPORT AGENCIES—Question, Mr. Lionel Cohen; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 262

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS)—ANGLING IN THE ORNAMENTAL WATERS—Questions, Mr. Lawson; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 262

REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR—CLAIMS OF THE LAND COMPANY—Question, Mr. J. Howard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 263

RUSSIA—ILL-TREATMENT OF AN M.P. AT MOSCOW—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answers, Mr. Montagu, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 263

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIVER BARROW — Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 264

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 265

ARMY — ROYAL MILITARY ASYLUM — ADMISSION OF SOLDIERS' CHILDREN—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 266

[*August* 23.] Page

ARMY — THE FORCE IN BURMAH — REINFORCEMENTS— Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 266
FIJI—DECREASE OF POPULATION AND TRADE — Question, Mr. Henniker-Heaton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 267
SOUTH PACIFIC—REPORTED ANNEXATION OF THE ELLICE ISLANDS—Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 268
WESTMINSTER HALL (RESTORATION) — Questions, Mr. F. S. Powell, Sir Henry Tyler; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 268
ARMY—THE WAR OFFICE—DEFECTIVE MILITARY WEAPONS — Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 269
NAVY—BREECH-LOADING GUNS—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 269
METROPOLIS—TEMPLE BAR—Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 270
IRELAND (SOUTH-WEST DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER—Questions, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 270
INDIAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT—GRIEVANCES OF OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 271
ADMIRALTY—ENGINE-ROOM ARTIFICERS—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 271
CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT BELFAST — CHARGES AGAINST THE CONSTABULARY — Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 272
CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY — Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 273
RAILWAY CHARGES—THE RETURN — Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) .. 273
LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—MARYBOROUGH DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM—Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 274
GOLD AND SILVER HALL-MARKING—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) .. 274
WEST INDIES—ISLAND OF JAMAICA — ALLEGED DEPREDATIONS BY A SPANISH MAN-OF-WAR—Question, Sir John Simon; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 275
LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—ARREST OF THE CROFTERS AT TIREE — Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 276
THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EMPLOYMENT AT EVICTIONS—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 276
METROPOLIS — THE NEW POLICE OFFICES — Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 277

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [THIRD NIGHT]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August:] —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 277

[*August* 23.]

Page

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH—*continued.*

After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

—o—

Adulteration Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cuthbert Quilter, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Lord Elcho, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Francis Stevenson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 19] 364

Divorce (Law of Evidence Amendment) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Henry Howorth, Mr. Gent-Davis, Mr. R. Mowbray*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 20] .. 364

Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Thomas Ellis, Mr. Puleston*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 21] 364

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Saunderson, Mr. T. W. Russell*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 22] 365

Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Shirley, Mr. Quilter, Mr. Gane, Mr. T. W. Russell*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 23] 365

Linen (Ireland) Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to, and reported:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Macartney, Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 24] 365

Railway Freights Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Nolan, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Marum*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 25] 365

Evictions (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stack, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Finucane, Mr. O'Doherty*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 26] 365

Parliamentary Elections Expenses (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Finucane, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Maurice Healy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 27] 365

Belfast Government Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gray, Mr. Biggar*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 28] 365

County Government (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Maurice Healy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 29] 366

VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE—

Ordered, That the Committee to inquire into the Ventilation of the House be re-appointed:—List of the Committee 366

PRINTING—

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House:—List of the Committee 366

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Alexander Blane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Leahy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 30] 366

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Richard Power, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Sexton*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 31] 366

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Leahy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Tuite*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 32] 366

[*August* 23.]

Page

University Education (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Commins, Dr. Fox*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 33] 367

Allotments and Small Holdings Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 34] 367

[12.45.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 24.

QUESTIONS.

MAURITIUS—THOMAS WILKINSON—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 367

LAW OF TRADE MARKS — THE INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONVENTION—Questions, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Mundella; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) 368

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONTEMPT OF COURT—THE CASE OF SARAH KEDART—Question, Mr. Alfred Thomas; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 368

THE FISCAL LAWS—DUTIES ON IMPORTED MANUFACTURES — Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 369

LOCAL TAXATION—THE COUNTY RATE — CONTRIBUTIONS BY TOWNS HAVING SEPARATE QUARTER SESSIONS — Question, Mr. Powell-Williams; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 369

REGIMENTAL BANDS AT POLITICAL MEETINGS AND PUBLIC FESTIVALS—Questions, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 370

ADMIRALTY — DISCHARGE OF WORKMEN AT HAULBOWLINE — Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) 370

IRELAND—DUBLIN PORT—DUES ON FISHING BOATS—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 372

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—UNSANITARY CONDITION OF THE RATHDOWN UNION WORKHOUSE—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 372

ARMY — CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT — Questions, Sir William Crossman, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 373

INDIA — ANNUAL MIGRATION OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS TO HILL STATIONS — Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 375

IRELAND (SOUTH-WEST DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER — Question, Mr. E. R. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 375

POST OFFICE—"CLERKS IN WAITING"—"TABLE MONEY"—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 376

THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—TRUSTEES OF GOODFELLOW'S CHARITY, FIFEHEAD, NEVILLE, DORSET—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 376

POST OFFICE—ACCELERATION OF THE SCOTCH MAILS—Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 377

BULGARIA — RECENT REVOLUTION — Questions, Mr. Baden-Powell, Mr. Bryce, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 377

AFGHAN DEMARCATION COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 378

[*August* 24.] *Page*

Venezuela — Seizure of the Ships "Henrietta" and "Josephine"— Claims of British Subjects — Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 379

Richmond Park—Tricycles and Bicycles — Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 379

Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Discharge of a Clerk—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 380

West Indies—Island of Jamaica—Alleged Depredations by a Spanish Man-of-War — Question, Sir John Simon; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 380

MOTION.

Business of the House—Motion for the Address—

Moved, "That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. 381

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate [Fourth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August :] —Question again proposed :—Debate *resumed* 382

Tenant Farmers (Ireland)—Evictions from Inability to Pay Rent— Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words,—"And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are,"—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned," — (*Sir Thomas Esmonde:*)—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*— Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

MOTIONS.

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill—

Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for facilitating the proceedings of the Commissioners appointed to hold a Court of Inquiry respecting Riots and Disturbances at Belfast,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) 482

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 35.]

Public Petitions—

Select Committee appointed and nominated:—List of the Committee 485

Open Spaces and Recreation Grounds (Dublin) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Murphy, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Timothy Harrington*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 36] 485

[*August* 24.] Page

Railway Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Channing, Mr. A. Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Charles Parker, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Lawson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 37] 485

Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Waring, Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Baden-Powell*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 38] 486

[1.0.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—[ADJOURNED DEBATE] [FIFTH NIGHT]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 486

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT—Resolution, Mr. Parnell.

After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Parliamentary Elections Law Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Picton*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 39] .. 529

[5.30.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 26.

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Clancy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 530

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — GALWAY ASSIZES (SLIGO) — Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 531

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — CAVALRY SADDLES — Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 532

SEEDS (IRELAND) ACT—REPAYMENTS—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 532

IRELAND — STATISTICS OF POPULATION — CORK CO. — Questions, Mr. Donal Sullivan, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 533

ARMY CONTRACTS — SUPPLY OF ARMY CLOTHING — Questions, Mr. Hooper, Dr. Tanner, Mr. Mahony; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 534

PUBLIC HEALTH—HYDROPHOBIA — M. PASTEUR'S RESEARCHES — Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 535

INDIA (BOMBAY)—CASE OF MR. A. MORTON, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 536

[*August* 26.] *Page*

EDUCATION (IRELAND) — BOARD OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION — Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 537

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — THE HERRING FISHERIES ON THE SOUTH COAST—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 538

TURKEY—DISTURBANCES IN ARMENIA (VAN) — Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 539

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST RIOTS — TRIAL OF PRISONERS —Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 539

THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES—A ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 540

POST OFFICE—POSTMASTERSHIPS—THE WELSH LANGUAGE—Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 541

CYPRUS—THE ANNUAL TRIBUTE—Question, Colonel Bridgeman; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 541

ARMY—AGE RETIREMENT—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 541

BURMAH—INUNDATION OF MANDALAY—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 542

TRADE MARKS ACT—REGISTRATION OF "FANCY WORDS" — Question, Mr. Lockwood; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 543

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND) — THE DRAINAGE OF THE BANN—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 543

ARMY—"APPREHENDED DISTURBANCES IN ENGLAND"—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 544

STATE OF IRELAND — CONSTABULARY FORCE AT MILLSTREET, CO. CORK—Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 545

ADMIRALTY—DISCHARGE OF SHIPWRIGHTS AT HAULBOWLINE—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) 546

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ACTS, 1883 AND 1885 — SCHEME FOR COTTAGES IN MACROOM UNION—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 546

EMIGRATION — THE EMIGRANTS' INFORMATION BUREAU — Question, Mr. Rankin; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 546

BURMAH—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION — THE COST — Question, Mr. James Stuart; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 547

INDIA — ANNUAL MIGRATION OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS TO HILL STATIONS—Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 547

IRELAND — DISTRESS IN THE WEST — MR. TUKE'S REPORT—Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 548

ASIATIC RUSSIA — THE FREE PORT OF BATOUM — Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 548

BULGARIA—REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER — Questions, Sir Richard Temple, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 549

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[August 26.]

Page

North Wales — Collection of Tithes — Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Kenyon; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews); Question, Mr. Sexton [No reply] 551

Board of Trade—The Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett—Questions, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Addison, Mr. Baden-Powell; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms), Mr. Mundella 551

Burmah—Public Works—Railways—Questions, Mr. Dalrymple; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 553

Universities (Scotland) Bill — Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 554

Parliament — Palace of Westminster — Ventilation of the House—Question, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 554

Army (Ordnance Department)—Manufacture of Nordenfelt Guns at Woolwich—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 555

Evictions (Ireland) — Wexford Co. — Questions, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. T. C. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 555

Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—The Riots at Belfast—Questions, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 557

Commissioners of Irish Lights—Attendance of Lightkeepers at Divine Service—Question, Mr. Johnston; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 558

Post Office—Female Clerks — Question, Mr. Baumann; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 559

Locomotives Act, 1878 — Bye-Laws of Road Trustees — Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) .. 560

Admiralty—Engine Room Artificers — Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 560

Mauritius—Official Dissensions — Questions, Mr. Baden-Powell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 561

Burmah — The Military Expedition — Appointment of Commander-in-Chief — Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 562

England and China — Treaty Regarding Burmah — Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 562

Law and Police (Scotland) — Bye-Laws as to Bicycles and Tricycles —Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 563

Army—Charges against the Ordnance Department—Observations, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 563

Ireland (South-West District) — Sir Redvers Buller — Question, Mr. E. R. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 564

New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House)—

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. E. R. Russell*) .. 565

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 146, Noes 241; Majority 95.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 599

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [SIXTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 602

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT—Resolution, Mr. Parnell 602

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton:*)—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS—

Select Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee 653

PARLIAMENT—SELECTION—

Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee 653

Shop Hours Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Macnaghten*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 40] .. 653

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—

Committee *appointed* and *nominated:*—List of the Committee 653

[12.30.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 27.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS—

Ordered, That the Select Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

Ordered, That Sir EDWARD BIRKBECK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CUBITT, and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH be added to the Committee.

Ordered, That so much of Standing Order No. 91 as fixes five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the Session, Three be the quorum of the Committee,—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—Withdrawal of Motion, Sir William Crossman 654

QUESTIONS.

TITHE COMMUTATION ACT, 1836—"THE TITHE WAR IN WALES"—Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 654

ARMY—CANTEENS—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 655

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—ATTEMPTED DISTURBANCE AT GILFORD, Co. ARMAGH—Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 655

[*August* 27.] *Page*

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — MR. GRAY, OF GLENANN, CO. ARMAGH—Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 656
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. SINCLAIR, NEWRY—Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 656
WEST INDIA ISLANDS—DOMINICA—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 656
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE ENNISKILLEN MAGISTRATES — "THE QUEEN *v.* JAMES PHAIR"—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 657
NAVY—THE MEDITERRANEAN SQUADRON—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 658
JAPAN—CONCESSIONS TO GERMAN TRADERS—Question, Mr. Brooke Robinson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 659
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—LIMERICK POST OFFICE—SALARIES OF THE LETTER CARRIERS AND CLERKS—Question, Mr. Henry Gill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 659
TITHE COMMUTATION ACT, 1836—DISTRAINT FOR TITHE—LLANARMON PARISH—Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 660
ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—MANUFACTURE OF MATERIALS OF WAR—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 661
DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT WITH CREDITORS — LEGISLATION — Question, Mr. Addison; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 662
THE MAURITIUS—SIR JOHN POPE HENNESSY AND MR. CLIFFORD LLOYD—Questions, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 662
INDIA—THE DEPRECIATION OF SILVER—Question, Mr. Samuel Smith; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 663
NAVY — ARMOUR-PIERCING BREECH-LOADING GUNS — Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 663
METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD—SMALL-POX HOSPITAL AT DARENTH—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 664
THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES) — THE SOMERSET MAGISTRACY—Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 664
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—TRIAL OF THE WALKERS (BELFAST)—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 665
IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER — Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Dillon; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 666
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE — SECRET SERVICE MONEY — Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 667
ARMY — ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT — THE 43-TON GUNS—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 668
EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—LORD CLANRICARDE'S WOODFORD ESTATE, CO. GALWAY—Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 669
BULGARIA—ATTEMPTED REVOLUTION — PRINCE ALEXANDER — Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 670

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—[ADJOURNED DEBATE [SEVENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 670

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT—Resolution, Mr. Parnell 670

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 181, Noes 304; Majority 123.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 766

Original Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. S. Smith:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

ADJOURNMENT—

Resolved, That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till *Monday* next,—(*Mr. Jackson.*) [1.30.]

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 30.

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS *reported* .. 770

INDIA (BOMBAY)—THE SIRDAR PRITHI RAO—Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) 771

[4.45.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 30.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—COMMITTEE OF SELECTION—

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Nine Members.

Ordered, That Lord EDWARD CAVENDISH be discharged.

Ordered, That Sir H. H. VIVIAN and Sir ROBERT N. FOWLER be added to the Committee,—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

QUESTIONS.

BOARD OF TRADE—HARBOUR LOANS—Question, Mr. C. T. D. Acland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 775

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTES—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 775

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—HEAD CONSTABLE MAGEE—Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 775

RAILWAY RATES—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Baden-Powell; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 776

EDUCATION—SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION IN THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS—Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 776

[*August* 30.] Page

BURIALS (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE CHURCHYARD AT BOLTON-ON-DEARNE, YORKSHIRE—Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 777
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS)—SWINE FEVER—INOCULATION—Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 777
FINANCE, &c. — IMPERIAL TAXATION ON REAL AND REALIZED PERSONAL PROPERTY—Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 778
FINANCE, &c.—TAXATION ON PERSONAL PROPERTY IN FRANCE, &c.—Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 778
FRANCE — SUMMARY REMOVAL OF REV. W. J. DROUGHT — Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. E. Robertson; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 779
PUBLIC HEALTH—RIVER POLLUTION—THE RIVER CHESS, HERTS—Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 779
ROYAL COMMISSION ON TRADE AND AGRICULTURE — FOREIGN BOUNTIES—Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 781
INLAND REVENUE—REPAYMENT OF INCOME TAX — Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 782
PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—RE-OPENING OF WESTMINSTER HALL—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 782
ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — HEAVY GUNS -- Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 783
ADMIRALTY—MEDALS OF THE SAILORS AND NAVAL OFFICERS IN THE EGYPTIAN AND SOUDAN CAMPAIGNS—Question, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 783
TRADE MARKS—FALSE MARKING AND WRAPPING—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 784
INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—LOUGH ERNE — Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) .. 784
SOUTH AFRICA—PONDOLAND—THE PONDOS—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 784
ENDOWED SCHOOLS (ENGLAND AND WALES)—REMOVAL OF CHRIST'S HOSPITAL —Question, Mr. Bonsor; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 785
FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND) — CULDAFF SALMON FISHERY PIER—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 786
MARRIAGES (ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS)—Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 787
FIRES (METROPOLIS)—FIRE AT MILLWALL — Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 787
AGRICULTURAL LEASES (SCOTLAND)—A COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—Questions, Mr. Esslemont; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 788
CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1884—EXTENSION OF ACT—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 789
VENEZUELA — TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES — Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 790
AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES—QUEENSLAND—DIVISION OF THE COLONY — Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 790

ADMIRALTY — MR. W. H. WHITE, NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR AND CONTROLLER— Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 790

LAW AND JUSTICE — "BRYCE *v.* RUSDEN" — Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 791

BURMAH — GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1858, SEC. 27 — Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 792

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD—ACCOMMODATION FOR IMBECILE CHILDREN— Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 792

METROPOLITAN POOR AMENDMENT ACT, 1870 — RATIONS OF POOR LAW OFFICERS — Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 792

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes); Question, Mr. E. Harrington; [No reply] 793

PAYMENT OF TITHES — LEGISLATION — Question, Mr. H. R. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 794

FISHERY COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND)—TRAWLING—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 795

BULGARIA — PRINCE ALEXANDER'S RETURN — Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 795

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ORDERS —MOTIONS ON PERPETUAL PENSIONS AND INCIDENCE OF THE POOR RATE —Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Pickersgill; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 795

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL — Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 797

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [EIGHTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 797

BURMAH (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—INCIDENCE OF COST—

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words, "And this House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India,"—(*Mr. Samuel Smith*) 797

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

To leave out all the words after the words "Burmah, and" to the end of the proposed Amendment, in order to add the words "at learning that the Government have resolved to persevere in their policy of annexation, especially as the Native population have, by their active hostility and armed resistance to the invading forces, shown that they have no desire to live under British rule,"—(*Mr. Cremer*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment:"—After long debate, Question put: — The House *divided;* Ayes 201, Noes 125; Majority 76.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—*continued.*

Question put,

"That the words 'This House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India' be added to the Main Question."

The House *divided;* Ayes 125, Noes 199; Majority 74.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 858

Main Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Dr. Clark:*)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 122, Noes 197; Majority 75.—(Div. List, No. 6.)

Main Question again proposed 870

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Picton:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed 873

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. A. Sutherland:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*- Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

Secret Service (Repeal) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Jackson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Akers-Douglas*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 41] 873

Trust Funds (Railways) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Carew, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Cobb*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 42] 873

[1.0.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 31.

Roll of the Lords—

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be *printed.* (No. 10.)

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills—

Ordered, That Standing Order No. 72 be dispensed with in the case of all Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills suspended in the last Session of Parliament.

Committee of Selection *nominated:*—List of the Committee .. 874

Women's Suffrage Bill [h.l.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Denman*); read 1ª (No. 12) .. 874

[4.30.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 31.

QUESTIONS.

Belfast Main Drainage Bill—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Speaker 874

Post Office — Book Post Parcels — Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 874

Africa (West Coast)—Kidnapping on the Niger—Native Reprisals—Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 875

Admiralty—The Channel Squadron—Butterine—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, Lord Charles Beresford (A Lord of the Admiralty) .. 876

[*August* 31.] *Page*

FRANCE—AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CLASSES — Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 877

SPAIN — FERNANDO PO — EXPULSION OF THE REV. WILLIAM WELFORD—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 877

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—DUBLIN COMMISSION COURT HOUSE — Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 877

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPHIC MONEY ORDERS—Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 878

LOCOMOTIVES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878 — BYE-LAWS OF ROAD TRUSTEES (FORFARSHIRE) — Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 878

ADMIRALTY -PAY OF CREWS ON THE CHINA STATION—RATE OF EXCHANGE —Questions, Commander Bethell; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 879

COMMISSIONERS OF NORTHERN LIGHTS — WANT OF LIGHTHOUSES ON THE WEST COAST OF SHETLAND—Question, Mr. Lyell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 880

PARLIAMENT — PALACE OF WESTMINSTER — HOUSE OF COMMONS ARRANGEMENTS—A SELECT COMMITTEE—Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) .. 881

ADMIRALTY (DOCKYARDS)—WORKS AT HAULBOWLINE—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) 881

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—THE EAST PIER OF KINGSTOWN—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 882

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—THE CONSTABULARY (CASUALTIES)—Questions, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 882

NAVY (CONTRACTS)—SUPPLIES OF MESS PORK—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kerry, S.); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 883

DISPENSARIES (IRELAND)—ELY DISPENSARY, CO. FERMANAGH — Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 883

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — EVICTIONS IN WOODFORD, CO. GALWAY — COUNTY INSPECTOR O'BRIEN—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 884

COUNTY VOTERS ACT (SCOTLAND)—ASSESSORS—Question, Mr. More; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie); Observations, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) .. 885

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) — MR. C. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE—Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 886

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)—LOANS TO FISHERMEN—Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 887

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—TELEGRAPHIC DEPARTMENT — MISS B. DUFFY—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 887

INDIA—THE FOREST SERVICE—PENSIONS—Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 888

BULGARIA—ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF PRINCE ALEXANDER — Question, Mr. W. A. Macdonald; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 888

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*August* 31.] *Page*

Post Office (Scotland)—Postal Communication to the Outer Hebrides—Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 889

Inland Navigation and Drainage (Ireland)—The Lower Bann—Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 889

China — The Chefoo Convention — The Anglo-Chinese Convention, Pekin—Question, Mr. King; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 890

Spain—The Commercial Tariff—"Certificates of Origin"—Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 891

Law and Justice (Ireland) — The Enniskillen Magistrates — "The Queen *v.* James Phair"—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 891

Army—The Cavalry Regiment at Dundalk—Question, Mr. J. Nolan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 892

Metropolis — Dwellings of the Working Classes — Demolitions at Chelsea—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 893

Admiralty—Gun Practice at Southsea—Recovery of Shot—Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 893

Dispensary Districts (Ireland)—The Inchigeelagh Dispensary District – Medical Relief—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 894

The Magistracy (Ireland) — The Cork Magistrates — Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 895

Admiralty — Report on the "Collingwood" Gun — Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 895

Army (India)—European Cavalry Regiments—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 896

Treaty of Berlin—Article LIX — Batoum—Question, Mr. Henniker-Heaton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 896

Ireland (South-Western District) — Sir Redvers Buller — Stabling for Horses—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 897

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) .. 897

Bulgaria — Return of Prince Alexander — Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 898

Business of the House (Motion for the Address)—

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate [Ninth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 898

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH—*continued.*

CROFTERS SCOTLAND ACT, 1886—INADEQUACY OF THE ACT—

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words, "And this House humbly expresses its regret that the condition of affairs in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is very unsatisfactory; that the administration of the Law does not possess the confidence of the people; that the Naval Forces are supposed to be required to overawe a portion of the population; and that the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the formation of new holdings, where they are urgently required,"—(*Mr. Esslemont*) .. 898

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 121, Noes 203; Majority 82.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 987

Main Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.* [12.30.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1.

QUESTION.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—A CONVICT DEPÔT, TAYLOR'S HILL, CO. GALWAY—Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 990

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—[ADJOURNED DEBATE [TENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 991

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS IN BELFAST—REMEDIAL MEASURES—Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words, "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that certain circumstances accountable for the recent outbreak, prolongation, and repeated renewals of riots, raids for plunder, and conflicts with the Forces of the Crown, in Belfast, dictate the necessity for the prompt adoption of special measures for the maintenance of social order there, and that the most imperative and urgent of these measures are, the re-establishment of Her Majesty's authority in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters, the limitation of all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown, in times of public emergency, and adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, to magistrates directly responsible to Her Majesty's Government, and the increase of the local Constabulary Force to such a strength as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency, until Parliament, on consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, can proceed to the application of adequate permanent measures for the protection of life and property in certain quarters of Belfast,"—(*Mr. Sexton*) 991

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. P. M'Donald:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment Bill [Bill 15]

Moved, "That the Order for Second Reading be discharged,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*) 1053

Motion *agreed to:*—Order *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

MOTION.

Sale under Legal Process Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Handel Cossham, Mr. Howorth, Mr. William Hunter*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 43] 1053

[5.50.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2.

NEW PEERS 1054

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE *appointed*:—List of the Committee .. 1054

Women's Suffrage Bill (No. 12)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Denman*) .. 1054
After short debate, on Question, *resolved* in the *negative*.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—RETURN OF CASUALTIES—MOTION FOR A RETURN—
Moved, "That there be laid before this House Return of persons killed and wounded in the recent riots at Belfast,"—(*The Earl De La Warr*) 1058
After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn*. [4.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Portsmouth and Hayling Railway Bill (*by Order*)—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1061
Amendments made:—*Ordered*, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended (Queen's *Consent* signified.)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*:)—After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

QUESTIONS.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BANTRY BOARD OF GUARDIANS—Questions, Mr. Gilhooly; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach); Question, Mr. Healy [no reply] 1062

ARMY (CLOTHING DEPARTMENT)—CLOTH FOR ARMY UNIFORMS—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1063

SUGAR BOUNTIES (ABOLITION)—AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE—Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1063

THE PATENT OFFICE—THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1064

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPH CLERKS—SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES—Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1064

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT—THE ANNUAL REPORTS—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1065

PORT OF DUBLIN—THE GREAT EASTERN STEAMSHIP—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1066

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*September* 2.] *Page*

CRIMINAL LAW—EXCESSIVE SENTENCE—CASE OF GEORGE PARISH—Questions, Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Shirley; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1066

CUSTOMS SERVICE—PORT OF BELFAST—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1067

ADMIRALTY — CONTRACTS FOR PORK AND BUTTER — Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Forwood) .. 1068

IRISH CHURCH ACT—RELIEF OF GLEBE PURCHASERS—Questions, Mr. M. J. Kenny, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1068

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS AT GARRISON, CO. FERMANAGH—Questions, Mr. William Redmond; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1069

INDIA (MADRAS)—OFFICIAL SCANDALS—Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1070

INDIA (MADRAS)—THE LATE PRINCESS OF TANJORE—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1070

POST OFFICE—MAILS IN SUTHERLAND—Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1071

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—MEMORIAL OF FISHERY OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1071

ARMY CANTEENS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1072

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — CAVALRY SWORDS, PATTERN 1884 — Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1072

POST OFFICE—TELEPHONE COMPANIES—Questions, Mr. Dwyer Gray; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1073

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE BANTRY BOARD OF GUARDIANS—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1074

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) ACT, 1885—SITE OF COLDBATH FIELDS PRISON—Question, Mr. J. Rowlands; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1075

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT) — CLARE—SIR REDVERS BULLER — Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1076

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION IN THE HOUSE—Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1076

ARMY — SMALL ARMS — THE SWORDS OF THE 2ND DRAGOON GUARDS — Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1077

WAR DEPARTMENT—NAVAL ORDNANCE—THE "COLLINGWOOD" GUN—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1077

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—UNPAID EXTRA REMUNERATION TO POOR LAW OFFICIALS—Question, Mr. B. Kelly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1078

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—COMPOUNDING DEBTORS—Question, Mr. M. Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1078

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—MUNSTER WINTER ASSIZES—Questions, Mr. M. Healy, Mr. E. Harrington; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1079

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. MOLONY, R.M., CO. MAYO—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1080

[*September* 2.] *Page*

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—LOAN FOR A NATIONAL SCHOOL, MILTOWN MALBAY—Question, Mr. Dwyer Gray; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1081

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DEDUCTIONS FROM PENSIONS—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1081

DUBLIN PORT AND DOCK DUES—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 1082

MEDICAL ACTS — UNREGISTERED MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS — Questions, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1082

INDIA—HIGH OFFICIALS IN PRIVATE FIRMS—SIR DONALD STEWART—Question, General Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1083

THE TRUCK ACTS — MINES AND WORKS IN SCOTLAND — Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1083

POOR LAW — METROPOLITAN POOR AMENDMENT ACT, 1870 — METROPOLIS COMMON POOR FUND—Questions, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Pickersgill; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) .. 1084

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND) — BEAM-TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1084

EGYPT—BRITISH TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN—Question, Mr. Jennings; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1085

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—RESIGNATION OF DR. NEWELL—Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1086

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) — DISMISSAL OF MR. J. G. FITZGERALD—Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1086

POST OFFICE—FRIENDLY AND BENEFIT SOCIETIES AND MERCANTILE FIRMS—ADDITIONS TO CIRCULARS, AND OF HEADINGS TO INVOICES—Questions, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Schwann; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1087

LAW AND JUSTICE—IRREGULAR DETENTION AT THE MIDDLESEX SESSIONS—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1088

ISLANDS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC—THE NEW HEBRIDES—THE CONVENTION WITH FRANCE, 1878 — Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1088

PRISONS (IRELAND)—OUTBREAK OF FEVER IN MARYBOROUGH GAOL—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1089

PRISONS (IRELAND)—DISCIPLINE IN MARYBOROUGH GAOL — Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1090

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—THE NEW 68-TON GUN—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1090

POST OFFICE—ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE FROM GALWAY—Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1091

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—TREATMENT OF NATIVES—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1091

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—MANUFACTURE OF SHOT AND SHELL—Question, Sir Frederick Mappin; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1093

BURMAH—THE CHIEF BOSHWAY — Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1093

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—NUMBERS AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF THE FORCE—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1094

POOR LAW—RATIONS TO OFFICERS IN THE BETHNAL GREEN UNION—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1094

ARMY—MR. GUSTENBERG, LIEUTENANT, 20TH HUSSARS—Question, Sir John Simon; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1095

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE ESTIMATES—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1095

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [ELEVENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [August 31] on Motion for an Address [19th August:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* .. 1096

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—REMEDIAL MEASURES—Resolution, Mr. Sexton 1096

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 127, Noes 225; Majority 98.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1159

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:"—List of the Committee 1162

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE QUEEN'S SPEECH—Report of Address *brought up,* and read the first time .. .. ,, 1162

Moved, "That the Address be read a second time:"—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 121, Noes 228; Majority 107.—(Div. List, No. 9.)

Original Question again proposed, "That the Address be read a second time" 1165

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. James Stuart*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 120, Noes 223; Majority 103.—(Div. List, No. 10.)

Original Question again proposed 1169

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn*:)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

[1.15.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3.

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CROSSMAGLEN CONSPIRACY—RELEASE OF THE CONSPIRATORS—Questions, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1172

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CORK UNION—STOWAWAYS FROM LIVERPOOL—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1173

ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1173

[*September* 3.] Page

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—HIGH OFFICIALS IN PRIVATE FIRMS—Questions, Colonel Hughes-Hallett, Mr. Woodall; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1174

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—CASTLEBAR DISPENSARY—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1175

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—FIRING AT THE PERSON—CASE OF DENIS MURPHY—Questions, Mr. Gilhooly, Dr. Tanner, Mr. O'Hea; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1176

RAILWAYS—MIXED TRAINS—CONTINUOUS BRAKES—Question, Mr. Webster; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1177

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NEWRY UNION—POOR RATE FOR THE CAMLOUGH DIVISION—Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1178

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS IN KILKENNY CO.—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1178

POST OFFICE—POSTAGE OF CIRCULARS—Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1179

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—LIST OF VOTERS—NORTH LEITRIM—Question, Mr. Conway; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1179

THE FRANCHISE ACTS, 1885—EXTRA REMUNERATION TO POOR LAW OFFICIALS—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1179

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—TRAWLING IN GALWAY BAY—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1180

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—MARRIED COUPLES IN UNION WORKHOUSES—Question, Mr. Charles Gray; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1181

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS AT GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL—Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1182

ENGLAND AND THE COLONIES—IMPERIAL FEDERATION—A JOINT COMMITTEE—Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1182

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ACCIDENTS IN MINES—THE REPORT—Question, Mr. Arthur Williams; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1182

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND)—CORRUPT PRACTICES—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Lacaita; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1183

REGISTRATION OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES—THE REGISTRAR—Question, Sir Albert Rollit; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1183

FRANCO-CHINESE COMMERCIAL TREATY—PROHIBITION OF OPIUM TRAFFIC BETWEEN TONQUIN AND CHINA—Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 1184

BURMAH—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—CAPTAIN ADAMSON—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1184

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—CYPHER TELEGRAMS—Question, Lord Henry Bruce; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1185

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—CAPITATION GRANT TO THE VOLUNTEERS—Question, Mr. Esslemont; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1186

POST OFFICE—COUNTRY TELEGRAMS—Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1186

[*September* 3.] Page

ADMIRALTY—FREEING OF HASLAR BRIDGE, PORTSMOUTH — Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1186

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT — THE ALLOTMENT RETURNS — RETURNS FOR UNIONS AND PARISHES INSTEAD OF BY COUNTIES—Question, Sir John Dorington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 1187

POST OFFICE—THE GENERAL POST OFFICE—THE CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1187

PHARMACY ACT, 1868—PRESCRIPTIONS BY CHEMISTS—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1188

THE MAURITIUS—OFFICIAL DISSENSIONS—Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1189

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—RETURN OF ACCOUNTS—Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1190

BURMAH—INUNDATION OF MANDALAY—Question, Mr. Addison; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1190

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1191

ADMIRALTY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS IN TROOPSHIPS—Questions, Mr. M. Healy; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1191

ADMIRALTY—ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNS OF SHIPS—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1193

NAVY — H.M.S. "PHAETON"—Questions, Admiral Field; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1193

BULGARIA—MESSAGE OF PRINCE ALEXANDER TO THE CZAR — Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1195

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1195

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House the state of Ireland is such as to require the proposal of remedial measures by the Government, before the time of the House is appropriated solely to the Business of Supply,"—(*Mr. Dillon*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Ordered, That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed.

Ordered, That the Standing Order, No. 21, relating to Notices on going into Committee of Supply on Monday and Thursday be extended to the other days of the week,—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE QUEEN'S SPEECH—REPORT [ADJOURNED DEBATE]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question, "That the Address be read a second time:"—Question put:—Address read a second time.

PUBLIC SPEECHES—SPEECHES OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER AT BELFAST—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Address, the words, "And we humbly declare to Your Majesty, that certain language used and published by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in regard to the action which ought to be taken by a certain section of the Irish people, should the Bill for the better Government of Ireland (1886) pass into Law, was calculated to provoke breaches of the Law, and ought to be publicly withdrawn, in view of the preservation of the peace of Ireland,"—(*Mr. Labouchere*) .. 1228

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment,

To leave out from the word "used," to the word "calculated," in order to insert the words "by certain Members of this House, and their participation in Conventions held in Foreign Countries in reference to Irish affairs, have given colour to the allegations which have been publicly made and extensively circulated throughout the United Kingdom that such persons are or have been members or associates of the Fenian Brotherhood of the United States, or of the Irish Republican Brotherhood are,"—(*Colonel Saunderson,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment:"—After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 119, Noes 202; Majority 83.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1278

BURMAH—THE BRITISH AUTHORITIES — MILITARY EXECUTIONS — THE PROVOST MARSHAL—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Address, to add the words, "We humbly represent to Your Majesty that the pacification of Upper Burmah would be promoted by an independent inquiry into the mode of administering the Law in the Courts of that Country, and humbly pray Your Majesty to cause such inquiry to be made, and the results to be communicated to this House,"—(*Dr. Cameron*) 1280

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 81, Noes 192; Majority 111.—(Div. List, No. 12.)

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Address."

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND) — ADMINISTRATION — Observations, Dr. Clark; Reply, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald:)—Short debate thereon 1289

Question put, and *agreed to:*—To be communicated by Privy Councillors.

SUPPLY—

Moved, "That this House will, upon *Monday* next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty,"—(*The Secretary of State for War, Mr. W. H. Smith*) 1302

Motion *agreed to:*—Estimates referred.

WAYS AND MEANS—

Resolved, That this House will, upon *Monday* next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[*September* 3.]

Page

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF WAYS AND MEANS—Notice, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1303

Secret Service (Repeal) Bill [Bill 41]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1303
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Jackson*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*. [1.45.]

LORDS, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 6.

MALTA—THE DOCKYARDS—EMPLOYMENT OF MALTESE SUBJECTS—Postponement of Question, Earl De La Warr 1307
[4.45.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 6.

QUESTIONS.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT BELFAST — CONSTABLE MALONE—Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. McCartan; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1308

TRADE AND COMMERCE—COMMERCIAL EDUCATION—Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) .. 1309

ARMY (IRELAND) — CAVALRY REGIMENT AT DUNDALK — Question, Mr. J. Nolan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1309

CHINA—SMUGGLING IN CHINA—THE CHEFOO AGREEMENT, CLAUSE 9—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1310

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND) — CIRCUIT COURTS — Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) .. 1310

ARMY—7TH HUSSARS—SUICIDE OF A SERGEANT — Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1311

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE VETERINARY SURGEONSHIP — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1311

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — EVICTIONS ON LORD CLANRICARDE'S ESTATE, CO. GALWAY—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1312

ISLANDS OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC—H.M.S. "DIAMOND" — REPRISALS ON NATIVES—Questions, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Richard; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1313

ISLANDS OF THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC—ISLAND OF MALAYTA—H.M.S. "OPAL" —REPRISALS ON NATIVES—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1313

LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND) — DEATH BY DROWNING OF DONALD MACNAB —Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 1313

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—LAUNCESTON BOARD OF GUARDIANS—EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN A PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Borlase; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1315

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — INSPECTION OF WELSH SCHOOLS — INSPECTORS' REPORTS, 1884-5—Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1317

NAVY (DOCKYARDS) — WORKS AT HAULBOWLINE—Questions, Dr. Tanner, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1318

[*September* 6.] Page

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) — SITTINGS OF COURT OF REVISION, CO. TYRONE—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1319

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS — COUNTING AND DECLARING THE VOTES—Question, Mr. Baumann; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1319

THE CURRENCY—APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1319

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) — SITTINGS OF COURTS OF REVISION, CO. MONAGHAN — Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1320

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) — GIRVAN AND PORTPATRICK RAILWAY — Question, Mr. Hugh Elliot; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1321

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT — IMPORTS FROM THE DOMINION OF CANADA—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 1322

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1322

ADMIRALTY—CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS ON BOARD TROOPSHIPS — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1323

RAILWAYS (METROPOLIS) — BRIDGE ON THE NORTH LONDON LINE — Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1324

ARMY (ARMY CLOTHING) — LIMERICK CLOTHING FACTORY — Question, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1324

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — EMPLOYMENT OF GUNBOATS FOR CONVEYANCE OF LEGAL OFFICIALS—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1325

CENTRAL ASIA—THE AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1326

BULGARIA—REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER — Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson); Question, Sir Henry Tyler [no reply] .. 1326

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £30,800, to complete the sum for Divine Service.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £17,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Administration of Military Law, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887:"—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1328

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £173,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Medical Establishments and Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887:"—After debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1328

(4.) £285,000, to complete the sum for Militia Pay and Allowances.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1347

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1372

After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 155, Noes 64; Majority 91.—(Div List, No. 13.)

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £304,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1374
After debate, *Moved,* "That a sum, not exceeding £288,500, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. John O'Connor*:)—After further short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 55, Noes 150; Majority 95.—(Div. List, No. 14.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(7.) £223,000, to complete the sum for the Army Reserve Force.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1394

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £260,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1410
After debate, *Moved,* "That a sum, not exceeding £255,700, be granted, &c.,"—(*Dr. Tanner*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £426,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1428
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £396,500, be granted, &c.," —(*Mr. John O'Connor*:)—After debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 51, Noes 152; Majority 101.—(Div. List, No. 15.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill [Bill 35]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) 1456
After short debate, Second Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow.* [1.30.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7.

Their Lordships met;—and having gone through the Business on the Paper without debate, [House adjourned] [4.45.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—NUMBERS AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION—Questions, Colonel Sandys, Mr. Hooper; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1458
NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) ACT—CONDITION OF TEACHERS—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1459
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA TRAINING—INSTRUCTION FOR MILITIA REGIMENTS—Question, Mr. Seale-Hayne; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1459
LAW AND JUSTICE—STREET SPEAKING—CASE OF JOHN WILLIAMS—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1460
INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX UPON MARRIED WOMEN—Question, Captain Selwyn; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) .. 1461
DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—GLENGARUFFE DISPENSARY DISTRICT—Question, Mr. E. Harrington; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1461
LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS, NORTH WALES—THE FLINT ASSIZES—Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1462

[*September* 7.] Page

Spain—The "Mary Mark" Collision—Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1463
Army (Ordnance Department) — Colonel Hope's Gun — Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1463
Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—Firing at the Person, Derrygonnelly, Co. Fermanagh—Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1464
Dispensaries (Ireland)—Ely Dispensary—Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1464
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Country Fairs (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1465
Railway Accidents — The Penistone Accident — Brakes on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1466
Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Splenetic Blood Poisoning at Arnesby, Leicestershire—Question, Mr. Tapling; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 1467
Civil Service Writers—Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1468
Post Office (Savings Banks)—The Savings Bank, Hastings — Double Account—Questions, Major Ross; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1468
India (Finance, &c.)—Import Duty on Cotton Goods — Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Addison; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1470
Vaccination Acts—Prosecutions — Fees to Clerks of Board of Guardians—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1471
Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)—Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum—Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1471
Poor Law (England and Wales)—"Vagrants and the Local Government Board"—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1472
Fishery Board (Scotland)—Report for 1885 — Fishermen's Houses — Question, Mr. Duff; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1473
Registration of Electors (Ireland)—Revision Court at Ramelton, Co. Donegal—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1473
House of Commons—Appointment of Officers—Question, Mr. Richard Power; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1474
India—Administration of India — A Royal Commission — Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1474
Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act, 1885—Expenses of Preparing Lists—Payment of Officials—Mountbellew Union—Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1475
South - Eastern Europe — Contemplated Partition — Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1475
Fisheries (Scotland)—Loans to Fishermen in Crofting Parishes—Question, Mr. Angus Sutherland; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1476

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*September* 7.] Page

NORTHERN PACIFIC — OCCUPATION OF PORT HAMILTON — Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1476

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—DRAINAGE OF LOUGH ERNE—Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1477

PRISONS (IRELAND)—RE-ORGANIZATION—INCREASE OF SALARIES OF OFFICIALS—Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1477

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—IRISH-SPEAKING DISTRICTS — Questions, Mr. W. A. Macdonald, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1477

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1478

THE CURRENCY—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—NAMES OF MEMBERS—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1479

ARMY—REGIMENTAL BANDS AT POLITICAL MEETINGS AND PUBLIC FESTIVALS—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1480

RAILWAYS — RAILWAY BOOKSTALLS — BOYCOTTING OF MR. GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1480

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1480

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,369,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores for Land and Sea Service (including Establishments of Manufacturing Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1481

After debate, *Moved*, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,319,000, be granted, &c.,"—(*Colonel Hughes-Hallett* :)—After further debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question again proposed 1551

After debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

(2.) £465,800, to complete the sum for Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1577

(3.) £73,600, to complete the sum for Establishments for Military Education.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1583

(4.) £17,100, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Effective Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1585

(5.) £135,500, to complete the sum for War Office. — After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1591

(6.) £9,400, to complete the sum for Rewards for Distinguished Services.

(7.) £39,700, to complete the sum for Half Pay.

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £687,400, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Retired Full Pay, and Gratuities for Reduced and Retired Officers, including Payments awarded by the Army Purchase Commissioners, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1595

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*.

(9.) £59,700, to complete the sum for Widows' Pensions, &c.

(10.) £6,900, to complete the sum for Pensions for Wounds.

(11.) £12,200, to complete the sum for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1599

(12.) £742,100, to complete the sum for Out-Pensions.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1600

Supply—Army Estimates—Committee—*continued.*

(13.) £98,000, to complete the sum for Superannuation Allowances.

(14.) £20,900, to complete the sum for Retired Allowances, &c. to Officers of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Forces.

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again:"—Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Supply—Report—Resolutions [6th September] *reported*—

(1.) "That a sum, not exceeding £30,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Divine Service, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" .. 1602

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions 2 to 8, inclusive, *agreed to.*

(9.) "That a sum, not exceeding £426,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1604

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill [Bill 35]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) 1607

After debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. E. Harrington:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday.*

Metropolitan Poor Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Howell, Mr. Buxton, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Montagu, Mr. James Rowlands*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 44] 1628

[2.15.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8.

QUESTIONS.

Poor Law—Homeless Poor of the Metropolis—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Long) .. 1629

The North Sea Fisheries Convention—The Protecting Cruisers—Question, Sir Edward Birkbeck; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1629

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Navy—Returns of Ships of War—Observations, Sir Edward Reed; Reply, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton):—Short debate thereon 1631

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—NAVY ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of the Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1643
After short debate, *Moved*, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted, &c.,"—(*Dr. Tanner* :)—After further short debate, Question put :—The Committee *divided* ; Ayes 53, Noes 140 ; Majority 87.—(Div. List, No. 16.)
Original Question again proposed 1663
After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(2.) £66,000, to complete the sum for Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad —After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1667
(3.) £20,700, to complete the sum for Marine Divisions.
(4.) £1,205,000, to complete the sum for Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1675
(5.) £2,370,300, to complete the sum for Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1686
(6.) £8,400, to complete the sum for Martial Law, &c.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £134,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of various Miscellaneous Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1705
After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow ;* Committee also report Progress ; to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [7th September] *reported* 1709
First Resolution *postponed :*—Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*
Postponed Resolution to be considered *To-morrow.* [5.50.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9.

BULGARIA—REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER—Question, Earl De La Warr ; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Earl of Iddesleigh) ; Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell ; Reply, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Earl of Iddesleigh) 1710

MALTA—THE DOCKYARDS—EMPLOYMENT OF MALTESE SUBJECTS—Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr ; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) 1712

LEASEHOLDERS (IRELAND)—RESOLUTION—
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, all leaseholders in Ireland who at the natural expiration of their leases will come under the Land Act of 1881, or who may be subject to a fluctuation of rent during the term of their lease, should have access to the Land Commissioners for the adjustment of their rents,"—(*The Earl of Leitrim*) 1713
After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

POST OFFICE — POSTAGE OF PRINTED MATTER — Question, Observations, The Earl of Milltown ; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) 1719
[5.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE — RATES FOR TELEGRAMS TO THE CONTINENT — Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1720

[*September* 9.] Page

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTES—THE TREATY OF 1871—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1721

THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES AND THE UNITED STATES — A COMMERCIAL TREATY—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1722

MECHANICS' INSTITUTES—SUPPLY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS — Question, Mr. Wright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1722

BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES—THE CONFEDERATION—NOVA SCOTIA —Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1723

IRELAND—THE KINGSTOWN "BIRD'S NEST" — DETENTION OF CHILDREN—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1724

THE CURRENCY, &C.—THE GOLD COINAGE—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1724

CIVIL SERVICE CLERKS AND WRITERS — REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1725

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATHOLIC WORKPEOPLE—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1725

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY — THE FORCE IN BELFAST — Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1726

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—EXPENSES OF THE ROYAL HOSPITAL—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1727

ARMY QUARTERMASTERS—Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1728

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—KILDYSART GUARDIANS, CO. CLARE—Questions, Mr. Jordan, Mr. M. J. Kenny; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1728

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CONVICTION AT MILLSTREET PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1729

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — ARMY AND NAVY GUNS—Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1730

ASYLUMS FOR THE POOR (IRELAND)—MONAGHAN ASYLUM—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1730

ARMY (INDIA)—MEDICAL SERVICE—HONORARY COMMISSIONS—Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1731

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—SERGEANT INSTRUCTORS TO VOLUNTEER CORPS—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1732

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—ARRANGEMENTS IN CO. MEATH — Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1732

FRANCHISE (IRELAND) ACT—REMUNERATION TO CLERKS OF UNIONS, &C.—KINSALE—Questions, Mr. Hooper; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1733

A MINISTER OF EDUCATION—REPORT OF COMMONS COMMITTEE, 1884—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1733

NAVY—PAY OF SEAMEN—LOSS THROUGH DEPRECIATION OF SILVER—Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1734

[*September* 9.] *Page*

Evictions (Ireland)—Action of the Police at Woodford, Co. Galway—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1735

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Alleged Assault on Dr. D'Alton, of Branmore—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1735

Piers and Harbours (Ireland)—Unexpended Grants — Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) .. 1736

Post Office (Ireland)—Postal Facilities at Kinsale—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1737

Customs Estimates — Surveyor of the Port of London — Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1737

Inspectors under the Explosives Act—The Royal Irish Constabulary—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1738

Egypt—The Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops at Assouan—Question, Mr. R. G. Webster; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1739

Post Office (Telegraph Department) — Deficient Arrangements at West Ham—Question, Mr. Forrest Fulton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1740

The Metropolitan Police Force — Summer Clothing — Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1740

Metropolis (Main Drainage Outfalls) — Pollution of the River Thames—Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1741

Education Department—Schemes of the Charity Commissioners—Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1741

Army (Clothing Department) — Army Clothing Factory, Pimlico—Questions, Admiral Sir John Commerell, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1742

China and Burmah—Trade in Opium — Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1743

Admiralty—State of Europe—Reduction of the Dockyard Establishments—Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1743

District Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) — Salary of Officials—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1743

The Postal Union — Payment in French Currency — Question, Mr. Samuel Montagu; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1744

India (Madras) — The Land Union in Tanjore—Land Tax in Madras—Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1745

Army (Ammunition)—Cartridges—Questions, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1746

Fishery Piers and Harbours (Ireland)—Culdaff Pier—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1746

Education Department—Intermediate and Higher Education (Wales)—Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) 1747

Bulgaria—Abdication of Prince Alexander—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1748

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT—THE DONAGHMORE UNION SCHEMES—Question, Mr. William Macdonald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1748

NAVY—EDUCATION OF JUNIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICERS — ADMIRAL LUARD'S COMMITTEE—Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1749

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—DISCOVERIES OF GOLD—Question, Mr. Salt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1749

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS IN CAMP—Question, Colonel Eyre; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1750

LIABILITIES OF TRUSTEES—INDIAN GUARANTEED RAILWAY SHARES — Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1750

RAILWAYS—SAFETY RAILWAY COUPLINGS—Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1750

INDIA—TRANSFER OF THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT TO SIMLA—Question, Mr. James Maclean; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1751

FRANCE — ARREST OF MR. FARREN, A BRITISH SUBJECT — Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1751

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE WOODFORD PRISONERS (GALWAY)—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1752

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD — REPRESENTATION — Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1752

METROPOLIS—THE POOR RATEPAYERS OF LONDON—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1753

ARMY—ORDNANCE COMMITTEE—CALCULATED BURSTING STRAIN OF GUNS—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1753

NAVY—NAVAL SCHOOLMASTERS' PENSIONS — Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1754

INCOME TAX (IRELAND)—OVERCHARGE, EDENAGEE, CO. FERMANAGH—Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1754

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. C. E. Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) .. 1755

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES) — THE METROPOLITAN COMMON FUND —QUOTA FOR OFFICERS' RATIONS—Observations, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Speaker 1755

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE BARBAVILLA CONSPIRACY—Observations, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Speaker 1756

EDUCATION (GRANTS TO SCHOOLS)—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that it is expedient that every school conducted in suitable premises, with an attendance of not less than thirty scholars, under a duly certified teacher or teachers, and complying with the other provisions of the Code, and favourably reported on by Her Majesty's Inspector as being efficiently taught, shall be entitled to a share in the annual Parliamentary Grant for Public Education,"—(*Mr. Conway,*)—instead thereof 1757

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read—*continued.*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

SCOTLAND—CONTRAVENTION OF THE TRUCK ACT—Observations, Mr. Bradlaugh; Reply, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews):—Short debate thereon 1764

HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES (IRELAND)—THE ROYAL HOSPITAL, BELFAST—Observations, Mr. Sexton; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) 1772

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ADMINISTRATION—Observations, Mr. Tuite; Reply, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach):—Short debate thereon 1774

DEPARTMENT OF WOODS AND FORESTS—ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT—Observations, Mr. Labouchere; Reply, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson):—Short debate thereon 1787

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £9,931, to complete the sum for Royal University, Ireland, Buildings.

(2.) £17,000, to complete the sum for Science and Art Buildings, Dublin.

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords" .. 1793

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,278, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere:*)—After debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 98, Noes 173; Majority 75.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

Original Question again proposed 1811

After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £22,493, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1813

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,506 (including a Supplementary sum of £788), be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Department of Her Majesty's Treasury, and in the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel" 1824

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,506 (including a Supplementary sum of £788), be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere:*)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 66, Noes 181; Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 18.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) £40,632, to complete the sum for the Home Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1830

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,671, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs" 1838

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Dr. Tanner:*)—Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £17,016, to complete the sum necessary for Colonial Office.

(9.) £22,816, to complete the sum necessary for Privy Council Office.

(10.) £46,817, to complete the sum necessary for Board of Trade.

(11.) £142, to complete the sum necessary for Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1840

[*September* 9.] Page

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

(12.) £14,965, to complete the sum necessary for Charity Commission.
(13.) £14,554, to complete the sum for the Civil Service Commission.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1842
(14.) £20,955, to complete the sum for the Exchequer and Audit Department.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1845

NAVY ESTIMATES.

(15.) £61,600, to complete the sum for Medicines and Medical Stores, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1846
(16.) £134,700, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1847

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—REPORT—Postponed Resolution [7th September] *considered.*

(1.) "That a sum, not exceeding £1,369,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores for Land and Sea Service (including Establishments of Manufacturing Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887" 1855

After debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Submarine Telegraph Act (1885) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Baron Henry De Worms, Sir James Fergusson*) : *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 45] .. 1860

[2.15.]

LORDS.

NEW PEERS.

Thursday, August 19.

The Right Honourable William John Lord Monson, created Viscount Oxenbridge of Burton in the county of Lincoln.

Sir Michael Arthur Bass, Baronet, created Baron Burton of Rangemore and of Burton-upon-Trent, both in the county of Stafford.

Sir Thomas Brassey, K.C.B., created Baron Brassey of Bulkeley in the county of Chester.

Sir Henry Thring, K.C.B., created Baron Thring of Alderhurst in the county of Surrey.

Thursday, September 2.

The Right Honourable Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., created Viscount Cross of Broughton-in-Furness in the county Palatine of Lancaster.

The Right Honourable Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., created Baron Stanley of Preston in the county Palatine of Lancaster.

SAT FIRST.

Friday, August 6.

The Viscount Melville, after the death of his uncle.

The Lord Penrhyn, after the death of his father.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6.

For *Paddington* (*South Division*), *v.* Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

For *Bristol* (*Western Division*), *v.* Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

For *Birmingham* (*East Division*), *v.* Right honble. Henry Matthews, Secretary of State.

For *Strand*, *v.* Right honble. William Henry Smith, Secretary of State.

For *South West Lancashire* (*Newton Division*), *v.* Right honble. Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., Secretary of State.

For *Lincoln County* (*South Lindsey Division*), *v.* Right honble. Edward Stanhope, Secretary of State.

For *Middlesex* (*Ealing Division*), *v.* Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton, First Commissioner to the Admiralty.

For *Leicester County* (*Eastern Division*), *v.* Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

For *Manchester* (*Eastern Division*), *v.* Right honble. Arthur James Balfour, Secretary for Scotland.

For *Hampstead*, *v.* Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education.

For *Tower Hamlets* (*Saint George's Division*), *v.* Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie, President of the Local Government Board.

For *Dublin University*, *v.* Right honble. David Robert Plunket, First Commissioner of Works.

For *Cambridge University*, *v.* Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes, Postmaster General.

For *Isle of Wight*, *v.* Sir Richard Everard Webster, Attorney General.

For *Plymouth*, *v.* Edward George Clarke, esquire, Solicitor General.

For *Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews*, *v.* Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald, Lord Advocate of Scotland.

For *Bute County*, *v.* James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire, Solicitor General for Scotland.

For *Dublin University*, *v.* Right honble. Hugh Holmes, Attorney General for Ireland.

For *Liverpool* (*Walton Division*), *v.* John George Gibson, esquire, Solicitor General for Ireland.

For *Brighton*, *v.* Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott, Judge Advocate General.

For *Devon County* (*North East Division*), *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond, Commissioner of the Treasury.

For *Croydon*, *v.* Honble. Sidney Herbert, Commissioner of the Treasury.

For *Wigtown County*, *v.* Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet, Commissioner of the Treasury.

For *Marylebone* (*East Division*), *v.* Captain the honble. Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford, Commissioner of the Admiralty.

For *Sheffield* (*Ecclesall Division*), *v.* Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, esquire, Commissioner of the Admiralty.

For *Down County* (*West Division*), *v.* Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill, Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household.

For *Middlesex County* (*Enfield Division*), *v.* Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone, Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household.

For *Lewisham*, *v.* Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham, Vice Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household.

MONDAY, AUGUST 9.

For *Leith*, *v.* The Right honble. William Ewart Gladstone, who, having been returned for the said Borough of Leith and for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), hath elected to sit for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian).

For *Staffordshire* (*Burton Division*), *v.* Sir Michael A. Bass, Baronet, Manor of Northstead.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 10.

For *North Lancashire* (*Blackpool Division*), *v.* The Right honble. Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., President of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Plantations.

For *Northampton County* (*North Division*), *v.* The honble. Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley, one of the Grooms in Waiting on Her Majesty.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 19.

For *King's Lynn*, *v.* The Right honble. Robert Bourke, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 19.

Paddington (*South Division*)—Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill.

Bristol (*West Division*) — Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet.

Leicester (*Eastern Division*)—Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners.

Birmingham (*East Division*)—Right honble. Henry Matthews.

Strand—Right honble. William Henry Smith.

Lincoln County (*South Lindsey Division*)—Right honble. Edward Stanhope.

Middlesex (*Ealing Division*)—Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton.

Cambridge University—Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes.

Dublin University—Right honble. David Robert Plunket.

Tower Hamlets (*St. George's Division*)—Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie.

Hampstead—Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet.

Isle of Wight—Sir Richard Everard Webster.

Plymouth—Edward George Clarke, esquire.

Dublin University—Right honble. Hugh Holmes.

Liverpool (*Walton Division*)—John George Gibson, esquire.

Middlesex (*Enfield Division*)—Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone.

Sheffield (*Ecclesall Division*)—Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, esquire.

Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities—Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald.

Bute County—James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire.

Lewisham—Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham.
Manchester (*East Division*)—Right honble. Arthur James Balfour.
Brighton—Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott.
Devon County (*North-East Division*)—Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond.
Croydon—Honble. Sidney Herbert.
Wigtown County—Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet.
Down County (*West Division*)—Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill.
Marylebone (*East Division*)—Captain Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford.
Northampton County (*Northern Division*)—Honble. Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley.
South West Lancashire (*Newton Division*)—Thomas Wodehouse Leigh, esquire.

MONDAY, AUGUST 23.

Leith Burghs—Ronald Craufurd Munro Ferguson, esquire.
Stafford County (*Burton Division*)—Sydney Evershed, esquire.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 26.

North Lancashire (*Blackpool Division*)—Sir Matthew White Ridley, baronet.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 27.

Borough of King's Lynn—Alexander Weston Jarvis, esquire.

THE MINISTRY

Of the Most Noble the Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G., As Formed on Acceptance of Office in July, 1886.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister)	Most Hon. Marquess of Salisbury, K.G.
Lord Chancellor of England	Right Hon. Lord Halsbury.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Lord President of the Council	Right Hon. Viscount Cranbrook.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. Lord Randolph H. Spencer Churchill.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Henry Matthews.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Earl of Iddesleigh, G.C.B.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. William Henry Smith.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Viscount Cross, G.C.B.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Lord George Hamilton.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council on Agriculture	Right Hon. Lord John Manners.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Lord Stanley of Preston.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education	Right Hon. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, Bart.
Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scotch Education Department	Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. C. T. Ritchie.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. David Robert Plunket.
Lord Privy Seal	Right Hon. Earl Cadogan.
Lords of the Treasury	Hon. Sidney Herbert. Colonel William Hood Walrond. Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell.
Lords of the Admiralty	Admiral Sir Arthur W. Acland Hood, Vice Admiral Sir Anthony Hoskins, Vice Admiral Graham, Captain Lord Charles Beresford, Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury	Aretas Akers-Douglas, Esq. William Lawies Jackson, Esq.
Secretary to the Admiralty	Arthur Bower Forwood, Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Trade	Baron Henry de Worms.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	Walter H. Long, Esq.
Under Secretary, Home Department	Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department	Sir James Fergusson.
Under Secretary for Colonies	Right Hon. Earl of Dunraven.
Under Secretary for War	Right Hon. Lord Harris.
Under Secretary for India	Sir John Eldon Gorst, Q.C.
Paymaster General	Right Hon. Earl Beauchamp.
Postmaster General	Right Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes.
Surveyor General of Ordnance	Hon. Henry S. Northcote.
Financial Secretary to the War Department	Hon. W. St. John Brodrick.
Judge Advocate General	Right Hon. William Thackeray Marriott, Q.C.
Attorney General	Sir Richard E. Webster, Q.C.
Solicitor General	Sir Edward George Clarke, Q.C.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. John Hay Athole Macdonald, Q.C.
Solicitor General	J. P. Bannerman Robertson, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Marquess of Londonderry.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney General	Right Hon. Hugh Holmes, Q.C.
Solicitor General	John G. Gibson, Esq., Q.C.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon. Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Lathom.
Master of the Horse	Right Hon. His Grace the Duke of Portland.
Treasurer of the Household	Right Hon. Viscount Folkestone.
Comptroller of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Arthur Hill.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household	Right Hon. Viscount Lewisham.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Viscount Barrington.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard	Right Hon. Earl of Kintore.
Master of the Buckhounds	Right Hon. Earl of Coventry.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	Her Grace the Duchess of Buccleuch.

THE MINISTRY

OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE,

AT THE DISSOLUTION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT ON THE 26TH JUNE, 1886.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister)	Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Herschell.
Lord President of the Council	Right Hon. Earl Spencer, K.G.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. Sir William V. Harcourt.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Earl of Rosebery.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	Right Hon. Earl Granville, K.G.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Earl of Kimberley.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Marquess of Ripon, K.G.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. A. J. Mundella.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. James Stansfeld.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. John Morley.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland	Right Hon. Earl of Aberdeen.
Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scotch Education Department	Right Hon. Earl of Dalhousie.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council for Agriculture	Right Hon. Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth.
Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (E. & W.).	Right Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Postmaster General	Right Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Lords of the Treasury	Sir E. J. Reed, K.C.B. Cyril Flower, Esq. G. G. Leveson Gower, Esq.
Lords of the Admiralty.	Admiral Lord John Hay, Vice Admiral Sir Anthony Hiley Hoskins, Vice Admiral Wilson Graham, Rear Admiral James Elphinstone Erskine, and Robert W. Duff, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury	Right Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler. Arnold Morley, Esq.
Secretary to the Admiralty	John Tomlinson Hibbert, Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Trade	C. T. D. Acland, Esq.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	William Copeland Borlase, Esq.
Under Secretary, Home Department	Henry Broadhurst, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department	James Bryce, Esq.
Under Secretary for Colonies	Right Hon. George Osborne Morgan.
Under Secretary for War	Lord Sandhurst.
Under Secretary for India	Edward Stafford Howard, Esq.
Paymaster General	Lord Thurlow.
Surveyor General of Ordnance	W. Woodall, Esq.
Financial Secretary to the War Department	Herbert Gladstone, Esq.
Judge Advocate General	John William Mellor, Esq., Q.C.
Attorney General	Sir Charles Russell, Knt., Q.C.
Solicitor General	Sir Horace Davey, Knt., Q.C.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. John Blair Balfour, Q.C.
Solicitor General	Alexander Asher, Esq., Q.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl of Aberdeen.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. John Naish.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. John Morley.
Attorney General	Samuel Walker, Esq., Q.C.
Solicitor General	The Macdermott, Q.C.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon Earl Sydney, G.C.B.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Kenmare, K.P.
Master of the Horse	Right Hon. Earl of Cork and Orrery, K.P.
Treasurer of the Household	Right Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Comptroller of the Household	Hon. Edward Marjoribanks.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household	Right Hon. Viscount Kilcoursie.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Lord Sudeley.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard	Right Hon. Lord Monson.
Master of the Buckhounds	Right Hon. Lord Suffield.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	

ROLL OF THE
LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN

The First Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

50° VICTORIÆ, 1886.

Mem.—*According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons, the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.*

His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales.

His Royal Highness Alfred Ernest Albert Duke of Edinburgh.

His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearn.

His Royal Highness Leopold Charles Edward George Albert Duke of Albany.

His Royal Highness George William Frederick Charles Duke of Cambridge.

Edward White Archbishop of Canterbury.

Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury, *Lord High Chancellor.*

William Archbishop of York.

Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook, *Lord President of the Council.*

George Henry Earl Cadogan, *Lord Privy Seal.*

Henry Duke of Norfolk, *Earl Marshal of England.*

Archibald Henry Algernon Duke of Somerset.

ROLL OF THE LORDS

Charles Henry Duke of Richmond.
Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of Grafton.
Henry Charles Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort.
William Amelius Aubrey de Vere Duke of Saint Albans.
George Godolphin Duke of Leeds.
Francis Charles Hastings Duke of Bedford.
William Duke of Devonshire.
George Charles Duke of Marlborough.
Charles Cecil John Duke of Rutland.
William Alexander Louis Stephen Duke of Brandon. (*Duke of Hamilton.*)
William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland.
William Drogo Duke of Manchester.
Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle.
Algernon George Duke of Northumberland.
His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale.
Henry Duke of Wellington.
Richard Plantagenet Campbell Duke of Buckingham and Chandos.
George Granville William Duke of Sutherland.
Harry George Duke of Cleveland.
Hugh Lupus Duke of Westminster.

John Marquess of Winchester.
Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne.
John Villiers Stuart Marquess Townshend.
Robert Arthur Talbot Marquess of Salisbury.
John Alexander Marquess of Bath.
James Marquess of Abercorn. (*Duke of Abercorn.*)
Hugh de Grey Marquess of Hertford.
John Patrick Marquess of Bute,
William Alleyne Marquess of Exeter.
William Marquess of Northampton.
John Charles Marquess Camden.
Henry Marquess of Anglesey.
George Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.
Ernest Augustus Charles Marquess of Ailesbury.
Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol.
Archibald Marquess of Ailsa.
George Augustus Constantine Marquess of Normanby.
George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon.
William Marquess of Abergavenny.
Gavin Marquess of Breadalbane.

William Henry Earl of Mount Edgcumbe, *Lord Steward of the Household.*
Edward Earl of Lathom, *Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*
Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury.
Edward Henry Earl of Derby.
Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon.
George Robert Charles Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.
William Reginald Earl of Devon.
Henry Charles Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire.
Rudolph William Basil Earl of Denbigh.
Francis William Henry Earl of Westmorland.
Montague Earl of Lindsey.
Harry Earl of Stamford.
George James Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.
Henry Edwin Chandos Earl of Chesterfield.
Edward George Henry Earl of Sandwich.
Arthur Algernon Earl of Essex.
William George Earl of Carlisle.
William Henry Walter Earl of Doncaster. (*Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury.
——— Earl of Berkeley.
Montagu Arthur Earl of Abingdon.
Aldred Frederick George Beresford Earl of Scarbrough.
George Thomas Earl of Albemarle.
George William Earl of Coventry.
Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey.
William Henry Earl Poulett.
John Francis Erskine Earl of Mar. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

SHOLTO GEORGE WATSON Earl of MORTON. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

WALTER HENRY Earl of MAR AND KELLIE. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

CLAUDE Earl of STRATHMORE AND KINGHORN. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

GEORGE Earl of HADDINGTON. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

JOHN TROTTER Earl of LINDSAY. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

DAVID STANLEY WILLIAM Earl of AIRLIE. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

ALEXANDER Earl of LEVEN AND MELVILLE. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

GEORGE JOHN Earl of NORTHESK. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

DOUGLAS MACKINNON BAILLIE HAMILTON Earl of DUNDONALD. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

GEORGE WILLIAM HAMILTON Earl of ORKNEY. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

SEWALLIS EDWARD Earl FERRERS.

WILLIAM WALTER Earl of DARTMOUTH.

CHARLES Earl of TANKERVILLE.

CHARLES WIGHTWICK Earl of AYLESFORD.

FRANCIS THOMAS DE GREY Earl COWPER.

ARTHUR PHILIP Earl STANHOPE.

THOMAS AUGUSTUS WOLSTENHOLME Earl of MACCLESFIELD.

DOUGLAS BERESFORD MALISE RONALD Earl GRAHAM. (*Duke of Montrose.*)

WILLIAM FREDERICK Earl WALDEGRAVE.

BERTRAM Earl of ASHBURNHAM.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS Earl of HARRINGTON.

ISAAC NEWTON Earl of PORTSMOUTH.

GEORGE GUY Earl BROOKE and Earl of WARWICK.

SIDNEY CARR Earl of BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

WILLIAM THOMAS SPENCER Earl FITZWILLIAM.

FREDERICK GEORGE Earl of GUILFORD.

CHARLES PHILIP Earl of HARDWICKE.

HENRY EDWARD Earl of ILCHESTER.

REGINALD WINDSOR Earl DE LA WARR.

JACOB Earl of RADNOR.

JOHN POYNTZ Earl SPENCER.

ALLEN ALEXANDER Earl BATHURST.

ARTHUR WILLS JOHN WELLINGTON BLUNDELL TRUMBULL Earl of HILLSBOROUGH. (*Marquess of Downshire.*)

EDWARD HYDE Earl of CLARENDON.

WILLIAM DAVID Earl of MANSFIELD.

JOHN JAMES HUGH HENRY Earl STRANGE. (*Duke of Athole.*)

WILLIAM HENRY Earl of MOUNT EDGCUMBE. (*In another Place as Lord Steward of the Household.*)

HUGH Earl FORTESCUE.

HENRY HOWARD MOLYNEUX Earl of CARNARVON.

GEORGE HENRY Earl CADOGAN. (*In another Place as Lord Privy Seal.*)

JAMES HOWARD Earl of MALMESBURY.

JOHN VANSITTART DANVERS Earl of LANESBOROUGH. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

EDWARD NUGENT Earl of MILLTOWN. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

HENRY JOHN REUBEN Earl of PORTARLINGTON. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

HUGH Earl ANNESLEY. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

JOHN HENRY REGINALD Earl of CLONMELL. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

GEORGE CHARLES Earl of LUCAN. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

SOMERSET RICHARD Earl of BELMORE. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

JAMES FRANCIS Earl of BANDON. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

JAMES Earl of CALEDON. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

FRANCIS ROBERT Earl of ROSSLYN.

WILLIAM GEORGE ROBERT Earl of CRAVEN.

WILLIAM HILLIER Earl of ONSLOW.

CHARLES Earl of ROMNEY.

WALTER JOHN Earl of CHICHESTER.

SEYMOUR JOHN GREY Earl of WILTON.

EDWARD JAMES Earl of POWIS.

HORATIO Earl NELSON.

LAWRENCE Earl of ROSSE. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

SYDNEY WILLIAM HERBERT Earl MANVERS.

HORATIO Earl of ORFORD.

HENRY Earl GREY.

HUGH CECIL Earl of LONSDALE.

DUDLEY FRANCIS STUART Earl of HARROWBY.

HENRY THYNNE Earl of HAREWOOD.

WILLIAM HUGH Earl of MINTO.

ALAN FREDERICK Earl CATHCART.

JAMES WALTER Earl of VERULAM.

ADELBERT WELLINGTON BROWNLOW Earl BROWNLOW.

Henry Cornwallis Earl of Saint Germans.

Albert Edmund Earl of Morley.

Orlando George Charles Earl of Bradford.

Frederick Earl Beauchamp.

John Earl of Eldon.

Richard William Penn Earl Howe.

George Edward John Mowbray Earl of Stradbroke.

Francis Charles Earl of Kilmorey. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Charles Stewart Earl Vane. (*Marquess of Londonderry.*)

William Archer Earl Amherst.

John Frederick Vaughan Earl Cawdor.

William George Earl of Munster.

Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of Camperdown.

Thomas George Earl of Lichfield.

John George Earl of Durham.

Granville George Earl Granville.

Henry Earl of Effingham.

Henry John Earl of Ducie.

Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yarborough.

James Henry Robert Earl Innes. (*Duke of Roxburghe.*)

Thomas William Earl of Leicester.

William Earl of Lovelace.

Lawrence Earl of Zetland.

Charles William Francis Earl of Gainsborough.

Francis Charles Granville Earl of Ellesmere.

George Stevens Earl of Strafford.

Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of Cottenham.

William Henry Earl Cowley.

Archibald William Earl of Winton. (*Earl of Eglintoun.*)

William Humble Earl of Dudley.

John Francis Stanley Earl Russell.

John Earl of Kimberley.

Richard Earl of Dartrey.

William Ernest Earl of Feversham.

Frederick Temple Earl of Dufferin.

John Robert Earl Sydney.

Henry George Earl of Ravensworth.

Edward Montagu Stuart Granville Earl of Wharncliffe.

Thomas George Earl of Northbrook.

Arthur William Earl Cairns.

Edward Robert Lytton Earl of Lytton.

Edward Earl of Lathom. (*In another Place as Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*)

George Watson Earl Sondes.

Roundell Earl of Selborne.

Stafford Henry Earl of Iddesleigh.

Alexander William George Earl of Fife.

Robert Viscount Hereford.

Henry Viscount Bolingbroke and St. John.

Evelyn Viscount Falmouth.

George Stanley Viscount Torrington.

Charles William Viscount Leinster. (*Duke of Leinster.*)

Francis Wheler Viscount Hood.

Mervyn Edward Viscount Powerscourt. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Viscount Lifford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Henry William Crosbie Viscount Bangor. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Hayes Viscount Doneraile. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Cornwallis Viscount Hawarden. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Carnegie Parker Viscount St. Vincent.

Henry Viscount Melville.

William Wells Viscount Sidmouth.

George Frederick Viscount Templetown. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

John Campbell Viscount Gordon. (*Earl of Aberdeen.*)

Edward Fleetwood John Viscount Exmouth.

John Luke George Viscount Hutchinson. (*Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Richard Somerset Viscount Clancarty. (*Earl of Clancarty.*)

Wellington Henry Viscount Combermere.

Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury.

Rowland Clegg Viscount Hill.

Charles Stewart Viscount Hardinge.

George Stephens Viscount Gough.

Charles Viscount Eversley.

Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax.

Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport.

Edward Berkeley Viscount Portman.

Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook. (*In another Place as Lord President of the Council.*)

Robert Viscount Sherbrooke.

Richard Bickerton Pemell Viscount Lyons.

Henry Bouverie William Viscount Hampden.

Garnet Joseph Viscount Wolseley.

William John Viscount Oxenbridge.

Richard Assheton Viscount Cross.

Frederick Bishop of London.

Joseph Barber Bishop of Durham.

Edward Harold Bishop of Winchester.

John Thomas Bishop of Norwich.

James Colquhoun Bishop of Bangor.

Henry Bishop of Worcester.

Charles John Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

Thomas Legh Bishop of St. Albans.

James Bishop of Hereford.

William Connor Bishop of Peterborough.

Harvey Bishop of Carlisle.

Arthur Charles Bishop of Bath and Wells.

John Fielder Bishop of Oxford.

Richard Bishop of Chichester.

Joshua Bishop of St. Asaph.

William Basil Bishop of St. David's.

Anthony Wilson Bishop of Rochester.

William Dalrymple Bishop of Lichfield.

John Charles Bishop of Liverpool.

Ernest Roland Bishop of Newcastle.

Richard Bishop of Llandaff.

George Howard Bishop of Truro.

William Bishop of Chester.

George Bishop of Southwell.

Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.

Alfred Joseph Lord Mowbray.

George Manners Lord Hastings.

Edward Southwell Lord de Clifford.

Thomas Crosby William Lord Dacre.

Charles Henry Rolle Lord Clinton.

Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth.

Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botreaux. (*Earl of Loudoun.*)

Francis Robert Lord Camoys.

Henry Lord Beaumont.

Henry Lord Willoughby de Broke.

Sackville George Lord Conyers.

Hubert George Charles Lord Vaux of Harrowden.

Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth.

Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Braye.

Robert George Lord Windsor.

William Henry John Lord North.

St. Andrew Lord St. John of Bletso.

Frederick George Lord Howard de Walden.

William Joseph Lord Petre.

Frederick Benjamin Lord Saye and Sele.

John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour.

John Stuart Lord Clifton. (*Earl of Darnley.*)

John Baptist Joseph Lord Dormer.

George Henry Lord Teynham.

Augustus Frederick Fitzherbert Lord Stafford.

George Frederick William Lord Byron.

Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.

William Coutts Lord Ashford.

Horace Courtenay Gammell Lord Forbes. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles William Lord Sinclair. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles Lord Blantyre. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Walter Hugh Lord Polwarth. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Richard Edmund Saint Lawrence Lord Boyle. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery.*)

George Lord Hay. (*Earl of Kinnoul.*)

Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton.

Frederick George Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. (*Earl of Bessborough.*)

Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale.

George Florance Lord Boston.

Charles George Lord Lovel and Holland. (*Earl of Egmont.*)

George William Henry Lord Vernon.

Edward St. Vincent Lord Digby.

George Douglas Lord Sundridge. (*Duke of Argyll.*)

Edward Henry Julius Lord Hawke.
Henry Thomas Lord Foley.
Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor.
Thomas Lord Walsingham.
William Lord Bagot.
Charles Henry Lord Southampton.
John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley.
George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney.
Philip Reginald Lord Somers.
Richard Henry Lord Berwick.
Edward Lennox Lord Sherborne.
John Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. (*Marquess of Waterford.*)
Henry Bentinck Lord Carleton. (*Earl of Shannon.*)
Charles Lord Suffield.
Dudley Wilmot Lord Dorchester.
Lloyd Lord Kenyon.
Charles Cornwallis Lord Braybrooke.
Edward Lord Fisherwick. (*Marquess of Donegall.*)
Henry Charles Lord Gage. (*Viscount Gage.*)
Thomas John Lord Thurlow.
William George Lord Auckland.
Charles George Lord Lyttelton.
Henry George Lord Mendip. (*Viscount Clifden.*)
George Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. (*Earl of Moray.*)
Alan Plantagenet Lord Stewart of Garlies. (*Earl of Galloway.*)
James George Henry Lord Saltersford. (*Earl of Courtown.*)
William Lord Brodrick. (*Viscount Midleton.*)
Frederick Henry William Lord Calthorpe.
Peter Robert Lord Gwydir.
Charles Robert Lord Carrington.
William Henry Lord Bolton.
George Lord Northwick.
Thomas Lyttleton Lord Lilford.
Thomas Lord Ribblesdale.
Edward Lord Dunsany. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Edward Donough Lord Inchiquin. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Thomas William Lord Massy. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Robert Lord Clonbrock. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Charles Mark Lord Headley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Hercules Edward Lord Langford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Henry Francis Seymour Lord Moore. (*Marquess of Drogheda.*)
John Henry Wellington Graham Lord Loftus. (*Marquess of Ely.*)
William Lord Carysfort. (*Earl of Carysfort.*)
George Ralph Lord Abercromby.
Charles Edmund Lord Ellenborough.
Augustus Frederick Arthur Lord Sandys
Henry North Lord Sheffield. (*Earl of Sheffield.*)
William Macnaghten Lord Erskine.
George John Lord Monteagle. (*Marquess of Sligo.*)
George Arthur Hastings Lord Granard. (*Earl of Granard.*)
Hungerford Lord Crewe.
—— Lord Gardner.
John Thomas Lord Manners.
John Adrian Louis Lord Hopetoun. (*Earl of Hopetoun.*)
Richard Lord Castlemaine. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Charles Lord Meldrum. (*Marquess of Huntly.*)
George Frederick Lord Ross. (*Earl of Glasgow.*)
William Willoughby Lord Grinstead. (*Earl of Enniskillen.*)
William Hale John Charles Lord Foxford. (*Earl of Limerick.*)
Francis George Lord Churchill.
George Robert Canning Lord Harris.
Reginald Charles Edward Lord Colchester.
Schomberg Henry Lord Ker. (*Marquess of Lothian.*)
Henry Francis Lord Minster. (*Marquess Conyngham.*)
James Edward William Theobald Lord Ormonde. (*Marquess of Ormonde.*)
Francis Richard Lord Wemyss. (*Earl of Wemyss.*)

John Strange Lord Clanbrassill. (*Earl of Roden.*)

William Lygon Lord Silchester. (*Earl of Longford.*)

Clotworthy John Eyre Lord Oriel. (*Viscount Massereene.*)

Hugh Lord Delamere.

Orlando Watkin Weld Lord Forester.

John William Lord Rayleigh.

Edric Frederic Lord Gifford.

Hubert George Lord Somerhill. (*Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

James Ludovic Lord Wigan. (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.*)

Uchter John Mark Lord Ranfurly. (*Earl of Ranfurly.*)

George Lord De Tabley.

Charles Stuart Henry Lord Tenterden.

William Conyngham Lord Plunket.

William Henry Ashe Lord Heytesbury.

Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. (*Earl of Rosebery.*)

Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. (*Earl of Clanwilliam.*)

William Draper Mortimer Lord Wynford.

William Henry Lord Kilmarnock. (*Earl of Erroll.*)

Arthur James Francis Lord Fingall. (*Earl of Fingall.*)

William Philip Lord Sefton. (*Earl of Sefton.*)

Robert Bermingham Lord Clements. (*Earl of Leitrim.*)

Thomas Lord Kenlis. (*Marquess of Headfort.*)

William Lord Chaworth. (*Earl of Meath.*)

Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. (*Earl of Dunmore.*)

Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord Poltimore.

Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord Mostyn.

Henry Spencer Lord Templemore.

Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry.

John St. Vincent Lord De Saumarez.

Thomas Lord Denman.

William Frederick Lord Abinger.

Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.

Alexander Hugh Lord Ashburton.

Edward Richard Lord Hatherton.

George Henry Charles Lord Strafford.

Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord Worlingham. (*Earl of Gosford.*)

William Frederick Lord Stratheden.

Geoffrey Dominick Augustus Frederick Lord Oranmore and Browne. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Simon Lord Lovat.

William Bateman Lord Bateman.

James Molyneux Lord Charlemont. (*Earl of Charlemont.*)

Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord Kintore. (*Earl of Kintore.*)

George Ponsonby Lord Lismore. (*Viscount Lismore.*)

Derrick Warner William Lord Rossmore.

Robert Shapland George Julian Lord Carew.

Charles Frederick Ashley Cooper Lord De Mauley.

Arthur Lord Wrottesley.

Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley.

Frederick Henry Paul Lord Methuen.

Henry Edward John Lord Stanley of Alderley.

William Henry Lord Leigh.

Beilby Lord Wenlock.

William Lord Lurgan.

Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon.

James Lord Seaton.

John Manley Arbuthnot Lord Keane.

John Lord Oxenfoord. (*Earl of Stair.*)

Hussey Crespigny Lord Vivian.

Henry William Lord Congleton.

Denis St. George Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Victor Alexander Lord Elgin. (*Earl of Elgin and Kincardine.*)

William Henry Forester Lord Londesborough.

Charles Robert Claude Lord Truro.

Arthur Lord De Freyne.

Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards.

George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord Raglan.

Gilbert Henry Lord Aveland.

Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare (*Earl of Kenmare.*)

Henry Lord Belper.

Richard Wogan Lord Talbot de Malahide.

Robert Lord Ebury.

Charles Compton William Lord Chesham.

Frederic Augustus Lord Chelmsford.

John Lord Churston.

Henry Lord Leconfield.

Wilbraham Lord Egerton.

Godfrey Charles Lord Tredegar.

Fitz Patrick Henry Lord Lyveden.

Henry Charles Lord Brougham and Vaux.

Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaird.

Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord Westbury.

Francis William Fitzhardinge Lord Fitzhardinge.

Luke George Lord Annaly.

Robert Offley Ashburton Lord Houghton.

William Lord Romilly.

George Philips Alexander Lord Barrogill. (*Earl of Caithness.*)

Thomas Lord Clermont.

James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. (*Lord Athlumney.*)

Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)

Charles Stanley Lord Monck. (*Viscount Monck.*)

John Major Lord Hartismere. (*Lord Henniker.*)

Hedworth Hylton Lord Hylton.

George Sholto Gordon Lord Penrhyn.

Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth. (*Viscount Boyne.*)

John Henry Lord Kesteven.

Arthur Lord Ormathwaite.

Edward Lord O'Neill.

Robert Cornelis Lord Napier.

Jenico William Joseph Lord Gormanston. (*Viscount Gormanston.*)

John Hamilton Lord Lawrence.

James Plaisted Lord Penzance.

John Lord Dunning. (*Lord Rollo.*)

James Lord Balinhard. (*Earl of Southesk.*)

William Lord Hare. (*Earl of Listowel.*)

Francis Edward Lord Howard of Glossop.

Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord Castletown.

John Emerich Edward Lord Acton.

Thomas Charles Lord Robartes.

George Grenfell Lord Wolverton.

Algernon William Fulke Lord Greville.

Thomas Towneley Lord O'Hagan.

William Lord Sandhurst.

Frederic Lord Blachford.

Francis Lord Ettrick. (*Lord Napier.*)

James Charles Herbert Welbore Ellis Lord Somerton. (*Earl of Normanton.*)

Henry Austin Lord Aberdare.

James Lord Moncreiff.

John Duke Lord Coleridge.

William Lord Emly.

Chichester Samuel Lord Carlingford.

Thomas Francis Lord Cottesloe.

Edmund Lord Hammond.

John Slaney Lord Hampton.

John Lord Winmarleigh.

Charles Alexander Lord Douglas. (*Earl of Home.*)

John William Lord Ramsay. (*Earl of Dalhousie.*)

John Henry Lord Fermanagh. (*Earl of Erne.*)

William Richard Lord Harlech.

Henry Gerard Lord Alington.

John Lord Tollemache.

Robert Tolver Lord Gerard.

Mortimer Lord Sackville.

Colin Lord Blackburn. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)

Charles Bowyer Lord Norton.

George William Lord Shute. (*Viscount Barrington.*)

William Lord Watson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)

Lawrence Hesketh Lord Haldon.

Ivor Bertie Lord Wimborne.

Arthur Edward Lord Ardilaun.

Alexander Dundas Ross Lord Lamington.

Charles Frederick Lord Donington.

Arthur Edwin Lord Trevor.

Montagu William Lord Rowton.

William Francis Lord Mount-Temple.

Edward Hugessen Lord Brabourne.

Arthur Oliver Villiers Lord Ampthill.

WILLIAM MONTAGU Lord TWEEDDALE. (*Marquess of Tweeddale.*)

WILLIAM ULICK TRISTRAM Lord HOWTH. (*Earl of Howth.*)

DONALD JAMES Lord REAY.

HARCOURT Lord DERWENT.

HENRY JAMES Lord HOTHFIELD.

DUDLEY COUTTS Lord TWEEDMOUTH.

GEORGE WILLIAM WILSHERE Lord BRAMWELL.

JOHN DAVID Lord FITZ GERALD. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)

FREDERICK BEAUCHAMP PAGET Lord ALCESTER.

ALFRED Lord TENNYSON.

JAMES Lord STRATHSPEY. (*Earl of Seafield.*)

JOHN GEORGE Lord MONK BRETTON.

WALTER CHARLES Lord NORTHBOURNE.

ARTHUR SAUNDERS WILLIAM CHARLES FOX Lord SUDLEY. (*Earl of Arran.*)

JOHN ROBERT WILLIAM Lord DE VESCI. (*Viscount de Vesci.*)

MARMADUKE FRANCIS Lord HERRIES.

HARDINGE STANLEY Lord HALSBURY. (*In another Place as Lord High Chancellor.*)

MERVYN EDWARD Lord POWERSCOURT (*In another Place as Viscount Powerscourt.*)

ANTHONY HENRY Lord NORTHINGTON (*Lord Henley.*)

NATHANIEL MAYER Lord ROTHSCHILD.

EDWARD CHARLES Lord REVELSTOKE.

ROBERT PORRETT Lord MONKSWELL.

ARTHUR Lord HOBHOUSE.

RALPH ROBERT WHEELER Lord LINGEN.

EDWARD Lord ASHBOURNE.

ROWLAND Lord SAINT OSWALD.

ROBERT JAMES Lord WANTAGE.

WILLIAM BALIOL Lord ESHER.

THOMAS Lord DERAMORE.

HENRY JOHN Lord MONTAGU of BEAULIEU.

WILLIAM BULLER FULLERTON Lord ELPHINSTONE.

CHARLES JOHN Lord COLVILLE of CULROSS.

FARRER Lord HERSCHELL.

CHARLES HENRY Lord HILLINGDON.

HENRY Lord HINDLIP.

EDMUND Lord GRIMTHORPE.

RICHARD DE AQUILA Lord STALBRIDGE.

WILLIAM Lord KENSINGTON.

MICHAEL ARTHUR Lord BURTON.

JOHN GLENCAIRN CARTER Lord HAMILTON OF DALZELL.

THOMAS Lord BRASSEY.

HENRY Lord THRING.

FREDERICK ARTHUR Lord STANLEY OF PRESTON.

LIST OF THE COMMONS.

THE NAMES OF MEMBERS

RETURNED TO SERVE IN THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, SUMMONED TO MEET AT WESTMINSTER THE FIFTH DAY OF AUGUST, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND EIGHTY SIX, AS BY THE SEVERAL RETURNS FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY APPEARS.

BEDFORD.

NORTHERN, or BIGGLESWADE DIVISION,
Viscount Baring.

SOUTHERN, or LUTON DIVISION,
Cyril Flower.

BEDFORD BOROUGH.
Samuel Whitbread.

BERKS.

NORTHERN, or ABINGDON DIVISION,
Philip Wroughton.

SOUTHERN, or NEWBURY DIVISION,
William George Mount.

EASTERN, or WOKINGHAM DIVISION,
Sir George Russell, bt.

READING BOROUGH.
Charles Townshend Murdoch.

WINDSOR (NEW) BOROUGH.
Robert Richardson-Gardner.

BUCKS.

NORTHERN, or BUCKINGHAM DIVISION,
Egerton Hubbard.

MID, or AYLESBURY DIVISION,
Baron Ferdinand James de Rothschild.

SOUTHERN, or WYCOMBE DIVISION,
Viscount Curzon.

CAMBRIDGE.

NORTHERN, or WISBECH DIVISION,
Charles William Selwyn.

WESTERN, or CHESTERTON DIVISION,
Charles Hall.

EASTERN, or NEWMARKET DIVISION,
George Newnes.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY,
Rt. Hon. Alexander James Beresford Beresford-Hope, LL.D.,
Rt. Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes, M.A.

CAMBRIDGE BOROUGH.
Robert Uniacke Penrose Fitzgerald.

CHESTER.

WIRRAL DIVISION,
Edward Thomas Davenant Cotton.

EDDISBURY DIVISION,
Henry James Tollemache.

MACCLESFIELD DIVISION,
William Bromley-Davenport.

CREWE DIVISION,
Walter Glowe Bright McLaren.

NORTHWICH DIVISION,
Robert Verdin.

ALTRINCHAM DIVISION,
Sir William Cunliffe Brooks, bt.

CHESTER—*cont.*

HYDE DIVISION,
Joseph Watson Sidebotham.

KNUTSFORD DIVISION,
Hon. Alan de Tatton Egerton.

BIRKENHEAD BOROUGH.
Lieut.-General Sir Edward Bruce Hamley, K.C B.

CHESTER BOROUGH.
Robert Armstrong Yerburgh.

STOCKPORT BOROUGH.
Louis John Jennings,
Sydney Gedge.

CORNWALL.

WESTERN, or ST. IVES DIVISION,
Sir John St. Aubyn, bt.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CAMBORNE DIVISION,
Charles Augustus Vansittart Conybeare.

TRURO DIVISION,
William Bickford Smith.

MID, or ST. AUSTELL DIVISION,
William Copeland Borlase.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or BODMIN DIVISION,
Leonard Henry Courtney.

NORTH-EASTERN, or LAUNCESTON DIVISION,
Charles Thomas Dyke Acland.

PENRYN AND FALMOUTH BOROUGH.
William George Cavendish Bentinck.

CUMBERLAND

NORTHERN, or ESKDALE DIVISION,
Robert Andrew Allison.

MID, or PENRITH DIVISION,
James William Lowther.

COCKERMOUTH DIVISION,
Sir Wilfrid Lawson, bt.

WESTERN, or EGREMONT DIVISION,
Lord Muncaster.

CARLISLE BOROUGH.
William Court Gully.

WHITEHAVEN BOROUGH.
Rt. Hon. George Augustus Frederick Cavendish Bentinck.

DERBY.

HIGH PEAK DIVISION,
William Sidebottom.

NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,
Thomas Dolling Bolton.

CHESTERFIELD DIVISION,
Alfred Barnes.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Lord Edward Cavendish.

MID DIVISION,
James Alfred Jacoby.

ILKESTON DIVISION,
Thomas Watson.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Henry Wardle.

DERBY BOROUGH.
Thomas Roe,
Rt. Hon. Sir William George Granville Venables Vernon Harcourt, knt.

DEVON.

EASTERN, or HONITON DIVISION,
Sir John Henry Kennaway, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, or TIVERTON DIVISION,
Lt.-Col. William Hood Walrond.

NORTHERN, or SOUTH MOLTON DIVISION,
Viscount Lymington.

NORTH-WESTERN, or BARNSTAPLE DIVISION,
George Pitt Lewis.

WESTERN, or TAVISTOCK DIVISION
Viscount Ebrington.

SOUTHERN, or TOTNES DIVISION,
Francis Bingham Mildmay.

TORQUAY DIVISION,
Richard Mallock.

MID, or ASHBURTON DIVISION,
Charles Seale-Hayne.

DEVONPORT BOROUGH.
John Henry Puleston,
George Edward Price.

EXETER BOROUGH.
Hon. Henry Stafford Northcote.

PLYMOUTH BOROUGH.
Sir Edward Bates, bt.
Sir Edward George Clarke, knt.

DORSET.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Hon. Edwin Berkeley Portman.

EASTERN DIVISION,
George Hawkesworth Bond.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Charles Joseph Theophilus Hambro.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Henry Richard Farquharson.

DURHAM.

JARROW DIVISION,
Sir Charles Mark Palmer, bt.

HOUGHTON-LE-SPRING DIVISION,
Nicholas Wood.

CHESTER-LE-STREET DIVISION,
James Joicey.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
Llewellyn Archer Atherley Jones.

MID DIVISION,
William Crawford.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,
Major General Sir Henry Marshman Havelock-Allan, bt., V.C., C.B.

BISHOP AUCKLAND DIVISION,
John Mellor Paulton.

BARNARD CASTLE DIVISION,
Sir Joseph Whitwell Pease, Bt.

DARLINGTON BOROUGH.
Theodore Fry.

DURHAM BOROUGH.
Thomas Milvain.

GATESHEAD BOROUGH.
Hon. Walter Henry James.

HARTLEPOOLS (THE) BOROUGH.
Thomas Richardson.

SOUTH SHIELDS BOROUGH.
James Cochran Stevenson.

STOCKTON BOROUGH.
Joseph Dodds.

SUNDERLAND BOROUGH.
Samuel Storey,
Edward Temperley Gourley.

ESSEX.

SOUTH-WESTERN, OR WALTHAMSTOW DIVISION,
William Thomas Makins.

ESSEX—*cont.*

SOUTHERN, OR ROMFORD DIVISION,
James Theobald.

WESTERN, OR EPPING DIVISION,
Right Hon. Sir Henry John Selwin-Ibbetson, bt.

NORTHERN, OR SAFFRON WALDEN DIVISION,
Herbert Colstoun Gardner.

NORTH-EASTERN, OR HARWICH DIVISION,
James Round.

EASTERN, OR MALDON DIVISION,
Charles Wing Gray.

MID, OR CHELMSFORD DIVISION,
William James Beadel.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,
Major Frederick Carne Rasch.

COLCHESTER BOROUGH.
Henry John Trotter.

WEST HAM BOROUGH.
North Division,
James Forrest Fulton.
South Division,
George Edward Banes.

GLOUCESTER.

MID, OR STROUD DIVISION,
George Holloway.

NORTHERN, OR TEWKESBURY DIVISION,
Sir John Edward Dorington.

EASTERN, OR CIRENCESTER DIVISION,
Arthur Brend Winterbotham.

FOREST OF DEAN DIVISION,
Thomas Blake.

SOUTHERN, OR THORNBURY DIVISION,
Edward Stafford Howard.

BRISTOL BOROUGH.
West Division,
Rt. hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, bt.
North Division,
Lewis Fry.
East Division,
Handel Cossham.
South Division,
Lt.-Col. Edward Stock Hill.

CHELTENHAM BOROUGH.
James Tynte Agg-Gardner.

GLOUCESTER BOROUGH.
Thomas Robinson.

HANTS.

Northern, or Basingstoke Division,
Rt. hon. George Sclater-Booth.

Western, or Andover Division,
William Wither Bramston Beach.

Eastern, or Petersfield Division,
Viscount Wolmer.

Southern, or Fareham Division,
Lieut.-Gen. Sir Frederick Wellington John FitzWygram, bt.

New Forest Division,
Francis Compton.

CHRISTCHURCH BOROUGH.

Charles Edward Baring Young.

PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH.

Major.-Gen. Sir William Crossman, K.C.M.G.
Sir Samuel Wilson.

SOUTHAMPTON BOROUGH.

Alfred Giles.
Adm. Sir John Edmund Commerell, V.C., K.C.B.

WINCHESTER BOROUGH.

Arthur Loftus Tottenham.

HEREFORD.

Northern, or Leominster Division,
James Rankin.

Southern, or Ross Division,
Michael Biddulph.

HEREFORD BOROUGH.

Sir Joseph Russell Bailey.

HERTFORD.

Northern, or Hitchin Division,
Robert Dimsdale (Baron of the Russian Empire).

Eastern, or Hertford Division,
Abel Smith.

Mid, or St. Alban's Division,
Viscount Grimston.

Western, or Watford Division,
Thomas Frederick Halsey.

HUNTINGDON.

Southern, or Huntingdon Division,
Arthur Hugh Smith Barry.

Northern, or Ramsay Division,
William Henry Fellowes.

ISLE OF WIGHT.

Sir Richard Everard Webster, knt.

KENT.

Western, or Sevenoaks Division,
Hon. Charles William Mills.

North-Western, or Dartford Division,
Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart-Dyke, bt.

South-Western, or Tunbridge Division,
Robert Norton.

Mid, or Medway Division,
Hon. John Stewart Gathorne-Hardy.

North-Eastern, or Faversham Division,
Herbert Thomas Knatchbull-Hugessen.

Southern, or Ashford Division,
William Pomfret Pomfret.

Eastern, or St. Augustine's Division,
Aretas Akers-Douglas.

Isle of Thanet Division,
Edward Robert King-Harman.

CANTERBURY BOROUGH.

John Henniker Heaton.

CHATHAM BOROUGH.

Sir John Eldon Gorst, knt.

DEPTFORD BOROUGH.

William John Evelyn.

DOVER BOROUGH.

Major Alexander George Dickson.

GRAVESEND BOROUGH.

John Bazley White, jun.

GREENWICH BOROUGH.

Thomas William Boord.

HYTHE BOROUGH.

Sir Edward William Watkin, bt.

LEWISHAM BOROUGH.

Viscount Lewisham.

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH.

Alexander Henry Ross.

ROCHESTER BOROUGH.

Col. Francis Charles Hughes-Hallett.

WOOLWICH BOROUGH.

Col. Edwin Hughes.

LANCASTER.

North Lancashire,

North Lonsdale Division,
William George Ainslie.

Lancaster Division,
James Williamson.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

BLACKPOOL DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B.

CHORLEY DIVISION,

Lieut.-Gen. Randle Joseph Feilden.

North-East Lancashire,

DARWEN DIVISION,

Viscount Cranborne.

CLITHEROE DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. Sir Ughtred James Kay-Shuttleworth, bt.

ACCRINGTON DIVISION,

Robert Trotter Hermon Hodge.

ROSSENDALE DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. Marquess of Hartington.

South-East Lancashire,

WESTHOUGHTON DIVISION,

Frank Hardcastle.

HEYWOOD DIVISION,

Isaac Hoyle.

MIDDLETON DIVISION,

Thomas Fielden.

RADCLIFFE-CUM-FARNWORTH DIVISION,

Robert Leake.

ECCLES DIVISION,

Hon. Alfred John Francis Egerton.

STRETFORD DIVISION,

John William Maclure.

GORTON DIVISION,

Richard Peacock.

PRESTWICH DIVISION,

Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray.

South-West Lancashire,

SOUTHPORT DIVISION,

George Nathaniel Curzon.

ORMSKIRK DIVISION,

Arthur Bower Forwood.

BOOTLE DIVISION,

Lieut.-Colonel Thomas Myles Sandys.

WIDNES DIVISION,

Tom Cottingham Edwards-Moss.

NEWTON DIVISION,

Right Hon. Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B.

INCE DIVISION,

Henry Blundell-Hollinshead Blundell.

LEIGH DIVISION,

Caleb Wright.

ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE BOROUGH.

John Edmund Wentworth Addison.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

BARROW-IN-FURNESS BOROUGH.

William Sproston Caine.

BLACKBURN BOROUGH.

William Coddington.
William Henry Hornby.

BOLTON BOROUGH.

Herbert Shepherd-Cross.
Lieut. Colonel Francis Charles Bridgeman.

BURNLEY BOROUGH.

Peter Rylands.

BURY BOROUGH.

Right Hon. Sir Henry James, knt.

LIVERPOOL BOROUGH.

Kirkdale Division,

George Smyth Baden-Powell, C. M. G.

Walton Division,

John George Gibson,

Everton Division,

Edward Whitley.

West Derby Division,

Lord Claud Hamilton.

Scotland Division,

Thomas Power O'Connor.

Exchange Division,

David Duncan.

Abercromby Division,

William Frederick Lawrence.

East Toxteth Division,

Baron Henry de Worms.

West Toxteth Division,

Thomas Bland Royden.

MANCHESTER BOROUGH.

North-West Division,

William Henry Houldsworth.

North Division,

Charles Ernest Schwann.

North-East Division,

Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, bt.

East Division,

Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.

South Division,

Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, knt.

South-West Division,

Jacob Bright.

OLDHAM BOROUGH.

James Mackenzie Maclean.
Elliott Lees.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

PRESTON BOROUGH.

William Edward Murray Tomlinson.
Robert William Hanbury.

ROCHDALE BOROUGH.

Thomas Bayley Potter.

SALFORD BOROUGH.

North Division,

Edward Hardcastle.

West Division,

Lees Knowles.

South Division,

Henry Hoyle Howorth.

STALYBRIDGE BOROUGH.

Tom Harrop Sidebottom.

ST. HELENS BOROUGH.

Henry Seton-Karr.

WARRINGTON BOROUGH.

Sir Gilbert Greenall, bt.

WIGAN BOROUGH.

Francis Sharp Powell.

LEICESTER.

EASTERN, or MELTON DIVISION,
Right Hon. Lord John Manners.

MID, or LOUGHBOROUGH DIVISION,
Edwin Joseph Lisle March Philips de Lisle.

WESTERN, or BOSWORTH DIVISION,
James Ellis.

SOUTHERN, or HARBOROUGH DIVISION,
Thomas Keay Tapling.

LEICESTER BOROUGH.

James Allanson Picton.
Alexander M'Arthur.

LINCOLN.

WEST LINDSEY, or GAINSBORO' DIVISION,
Henry Eyre.

NORTH LINDSEY, or BRIGG DIVISION,
Samuel Danks Waddy.

EAST LINDSEY, or LOUTH DIVISION,
Arthur Raymond Heath.

SOUTH LINDSEY, or HORNCASTLE DIVISION,
Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.

NORTH KESTEVEN, or SLEAFORD DIVISION,
Right Hon. Henry Chaplin.

LINCOLN—*cont.*

SOUTH KESTEVEN, or STAMFORD DIVISION.
John Compton Lawrance.

HOLLAND, or SPALDING DIVISION,
Hon. Murray Edward Gordon Finch-Hatton.

BOSTON BOROUGH.

Henry John Atkinson.

GRANTHAM BOROUGH.

Malcolm Low.

GREAT GRIMSBY BOROUGH.

Right Hon. Edward Heneage.

LINCOLN BOROUGH.

Frederick Harold Kerans.

MIDDLESEX.

ENFIELD DIVISION,
Rt. Hon. Viscount Folkestone.

TOTTENHAM DIVISION,
Joseph Howard.

HORNSEY DIVISION,
Sir James Macnaghten M'Garel-Hogg, bt., K.C.B.

HARROW DIVISION,
William Ambrose.

EALING DIVISION,
Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton.

BRENTFORD DIVISION,
Octavius Edward Coope.

UXBRIDGE DIVISION,
Frederick Dixon Dixon-Hartland.

BETHNAL GREEN BOROUGH.

North-East Division,

George Howell.

South-West Division.

Edward Hare Pickersgill.

CHELSEA BOROUGH.

Charles Algernon Whitmore.

FINSBURY BOROUGH.

Holborn Division,

Colonel Francis Duncan.

Central Division,

Frederick Thomas Penton.

East Division,

James Rowlands.

FULHAM BOROUGH.

William Hayes Fisher.

MIDDLESEX—*cont.*

HACKNEY BOROUGH.

North Division,

Major-Gen. Sir Lewis Pelly, K.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Central Division,

Surgeon-General Sir William Guyer Hunter, K.C.M.G.

South Division,

Sir Charles Russell, knt.

HAMMERSMITH BOROUGH.

Major-Gen. Walter Tuckfield Goldsworthy.

HAMPSTEAD BOROUGH.

Rt. Hn. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, bt.

ISLINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

George Christopher Trout Bartley.

West Division,

Richard Chamberlain.

East Division,

Cowley Lambert.

South Division,

Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, knt.

KENSINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

Sir Roper Lethbridge, knt., C.I.E.

South Division,

Sir Algernon Borthwick, knt.

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

Sir John Lubbock, bt.

MARYLEBONE BOROUGH.

East Division,

Lord Charles Beresford, Captain R.N.

West Division,

Frederick Seager-Hunt.

PADDINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

Lionel Louis Cohen.

South Division,

Rt. Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill.

ST. GEORGE, HANOVER SQUARE.

Lord Algernon Percy.

ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH.

North Division,

Hon. Charles Wallace Alexander Napier Cochrane-Baillie.

East Division,

Robert Grant Webster.

MIDDLESEX—St. Pancras Boro'—*cont.*

West Division,

Harry Lawson Webster Lawson.

South Division,

Sir Julian Goldsmid, bt.

SHOREDITCH BOROUGH.

Hoxton Division,

James Stuart.

Haggerston Division,

William Randal Cremer.

STRAND BOROUGH.

Right Hon. William Henry Smith.

TOWER HAMLETS BOROUGH.

Whitechapel Division,

Samuel Montagu.

St. George Division,

Charles Thomson Ritchie.

Limehouse Division,

Edward Samuel Norris.

Mile End Division,

Spencer Charrington.

Stepney Division,

Frederick Wootton Isaacson.

Bow and Bromley Division,

John Charles Ready Colomb.

Poplar Division,

Sydney Charles Buxton.

WESTMINSTER BOROUGH.

William Lehman Ashmead-Bartlett Burdett-Coutts.

LONDON CITY.

Sir Robert Nicholas Fowler, bt.
Right Hon. John Gellibrand Hubbard.

MONMOUTH.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Thomas Phillips Price.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Cornelius Marshall Warmington.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Col. Hon. Frederick Courtenay Morgan.

MONMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir George Elliot, bt.

NORFOLK.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Lord Henry Bentinck.

NORFOLK—*cont.*

SOUTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
William Amhurst Tyssen-Amherst

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Herbert Hardy Cozens-Hardy.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Edward Birkbeck.

MID DIVISION,
Robert Thornhagh Gurdon.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Francis Taylor.

GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH.
Sir Henry Whatley Tyler, knt.

KING'S LYNN BOROUGH.
Rt. Hon. Robert Bourke.

NORWICH BOROUGH.
Jeremiah James Colman,
Samuel Hoare.

NORTHAMPTON.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Lord Burghley.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Francis Allston Channing.

MID DIVISION,
Hon. Charles Robert Spencer.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Sir Rainald Knightley, bt.

NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH.
Henry Labouchere,
Charles Bradlaugh.

PETERBOROUGH BOROUGH.
Hon. William John Wentworth Fitzwilliam.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

WANSBECK DIVISION,
Charles Fenwick.

TYNESIDE DIVISION,
Wentworth Blackett Beaumont.

HEXHAM DIVISION,
Miles MacInnes.

BERWICK-UPON-TWEED DIVISION,
Sir Edward Grey, bt.

MORPETH BOROUGH.
Thomas Burt.

NORTHUMBERLAND—*cont.*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE BOROUGH.
Right Hon. John Morley,
James Craig.

TYNEMOUTH BOROUGH.
Richard Sims Donkin.

NOTTINGHAM.

BASSETLAW DIVISION,
William Beckett.

NEWARK DIVISION,
Viscount Newark.

RUSHCLIFFE DIVISION,
John Edward Ellis.

MANSFIELD DIVISION,
Cecil George Savile Foljambe.

NOTTINGHAM BOROUGH.
West Division,
Henry Broadhurst.

East Division,
Arnold Morley.

South Division,
Henry Smith Wright.

OXFORD.

NORTHERN, or BANBURY DIVISION,
Sir Bernhard Samuelson, bt.

MID, or WOODSTOCK DIVISION,
Francis William Maclean.

SOUTHERN, or HENLEY DIVISION.
Hon. Francis Parker.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY.
Rt. Hon. Sir John Robert Mowbray, bt., D.C.L.
John Gilbert Talbot, D.C.L.

OXFORD BOROUGH.
Alexander William Hall.

RUTLAND.

George Henry Finch.

SALOP.

WESTERN, or OSWESTRY DIVISION,
Stanley Leighton.

NORTHERN, or NEWPORT DIVISION,
Lt.-Col. Wlliam Slaney Kenyon Slaney.

MID, or WELLINGTON DIVISION,
Alexander Hargreaves Brown.

SALOP—*cont.*

SOUTHERN, or LUDLOW DIVISION,
Robert Jasper More.

SHREWSBURY BOROUGH.
James Watson.

SOMERSET.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Evan Henry Llewellyn.

WELLS DIVISION,
Sir Richard Horner Paget, bt.

FROME DIVISION,
Viscount Weymouth.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Henry Hobhouse.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Viscount Kilcoursie.

BRIDGWATER DIVISION,
Edward James Stanley.

WESTERN, or WELLINGTON DIVISION,
Charles Isaac Elton.

BATH BOROUGH.
Edmond Robert Wodehouse,
Lt.-Col. Robert Peter Laurie.

TAUNTON BOROUGH.
Hon. Samuel Charles Allsopp.

STAFFORD.

LEEK DIVISION,
Harry Tichborne Davenport.

BURTON DIVISION,
Sir Michael Arthur Bass, bt.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Hamar Alfred Bass.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
Justinian Heathcote Edwards-Heathcote.

LICHFIELD DIVISION,
Sir John Swinburne, bt.

KINGSWINFORD DIVISION,
Alexander Staveley Hill.

HANDSWORTH DIVISION,
Henry Wiggin.

HANLEY BOROUGH.
William Woodall.

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH.
Douglas Harry Coghill.

STAFFORD—*cont.*

STAFFORD BOROUGH.
Thomas Salt.

STOKE-UPON-TRENT BOROUGH.
William Leatham Bright.

WALSALL BOROUGH.
Sir Charles Forster, bt.

WEDNESBURY BOROUGH.
Hon. Philip James Stanhope.

WEST BROMWICH BOROUGH.
John Horton Blades.

WOLVERHAMPTON BOROUGH.
West Division,
Sir William Chichele Plowden, K.C.S.I.
East Division,
Rt. hon. Henry Hartley Fowler.
South Division,
Rt. hon. Charles Pelham Villiers.

SUFFOLK.

NORTHERN, or LOWESTOFT DIVISION,
Sir Savile Brinton Crossley, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, or EYE DIVISION,
Francis Seymour Stevenson.

NORTH-WESTERN, or STOWMARKET DIVISION,
Edward Greene.

SOUTH, or SUDBURY DIVISION,
William Cuthbert Quilter.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or WOODBRIDGE DIVISION,
Lt.-Col. Robert Hamilton Lloyd Anstruther.

BURY ST. EDMUNDS BOROUGH.
Lord Francis Hervey.

IPSWICH BOROUGH.
Charles Dalrymple,
Lord Elcho.

SURREY.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CHERTSEY DIVISION,
Frederick Alers Hankey.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or GUILFORD DIVISION,
Hon. William St. John Fremantle Brodrick.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or REIGATE DIVISION,
Sir James John Trevor Lawrence, bt.

SURREY—*cont.*

MID, OR EPSOM DIVISION,

Rt. hon. George Cubitt.

KINGSTON DIVISION,

Sir John Whittaker Ellis, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, OR WIMBLEDON DIVISION,

Henry Cosmo Orme Bonsor.

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM BOROUGH.

Battersea Division.

Octavius Vaughan Morgan.

Clapham Division.

John Saunders Gilliat.

CAMBERWELL BOROUGH.

North Division,

John Richard Kelly.

Peckham Division,

Arthur Anthony Baumann.

Dulwich Division.

John Morgan Howard.

CROYDON BOROUGH.

Hon. Sidney Herbert.

LAMBETH BOROUGH.

North Division,

Major-Gen. Charles Crawfurd Fraser.

Kennington Division,

Robert Gent-Davis.

Brixton Division.

Ernest Baggallay.

Norwood Division,

Thomas Lynn Bristowe.

NEWINGTON BOROUGH.

West Division,

Charles Wallwyn Radcliffe Cooke.

Walworth Division,

Lewis Henry Isaacs.

SOUTHWARK BOROUGH.

West Division,

Arthur Cohen.

Rotherhithe Division,

Charles Edward Hamilton.

Bermondsey Division,

Alfred Lafone.

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH.

Henry Kimber.

SUSSEX.

NORTH-WESTERN, OR HORSHAM DIVISION,

Sir Walter Barttelot Barttelot, bt., C.B.

SOUTH-WESTERN, OR CHICHESTER DIVISION,

Earl of March.

NORTHERN, OR EAST GRINSTEAD DIVISION,

Hon. Alfred Erskine Gathorne-Hardy.

MID, OR LEWES DIVISION,

Sir Henry Fletcher, bt.

SOUTHERN, OR EASTBOURNE DIVISION,

Rear-Admiral Edward Field, R.N.

EASTERN, OR RYE DIVISION,

Lieut.-Col. Arthur Montagu Brookfield.

BRIGHTON BOROUGH.

Rt. Hon. William Thackeray Marriott.
David Smith.

HASTINGS BOROUGH.

Wilson Noble.

WARWICK.

NORTHERN, OR TAMWORTH DIVISION,

Philip Albert Muntz.

NORTH-EASTERN, OR NUNEATON DIVISION,

John Stratford Dugdale.

SOUTH-WESTERN, OR STRATFORD-ON-AVON DIVISION,

Frederick Townsend.

SOUTH-EASTERN, OR RUGBY DIVISION,

Henry Peyton Cobb.

ASTON MANOR BOROUGH.

George Kynoch.

BIRMINGHAM BOROUGH.

Edgbaston Division,

George Dixon.

West Division,

Rt. hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

Central Division.

Rt. hon. John Bright.

North Division,

William Kenrick.

East Division,

Right Hon. Henry Matthews.

Bordesley Division,

Jesse Collings.

South Division,

Joseph Powell Williams.

WARWICK—*cont.*

COVENTRY BOROUGH.

Henry William Eaton.

WARWICK AND LEAMINGTON BOROUGH.

Rt. hon. Arthur Wellesley Peel.

WESTMORELAND.

NORTHERN, OR APPLEBY DIVISION,

Hon. William Lowther.

SOUTHERN, OR KENDAL DIVISION,

Earl of Bective.

WILTS.

NORTHERN, OR CRICKLADE DIVISION,

Mervyn Herbert Nevill Story-Maskelyne.

NORTH-WESTERN, OR CHIPPENHAM DIVISION,

Lord Henry Bruce.

WESTERN, OR WESTBURY DIVISION,

George Pargiter Fuller.

EASTERN, OR DEVIZES DIVISION,

Walter Hume Long.

SOUTHERN, OR WILTON DIVISION,

Sir Thomas Fraser Grove, bt.

SALISBURY BOROUGH.

Edward Henry Hulse.

WORCESTER.

WESTERN, OR BEWDLEY DIVISION,

Sir Edmund Anthony Harley Lechmere, bt.

SOUTHERN, OR EVESHAM DIVISION,

Sir Richard Temple, bt.

MID, OR DROITWICH DIVISION.

John Corbett.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Benjamin Hingley.

EASTERN DIVISION,

George Woodyatt Hastings.

DUDLEY BOROUGH.

Brooke Robinson.

KIDDERMINSTER BOROUGH.

Augustus Frederick Godson.

WORCESTER BOROUGH.

Hon. George Higginson Allsopp.

YORK.

North Riding,

THIRSK AND MALTON DIVISION,

Lieut.-Col. Hon. Lewis Payn Dawnay.

RICHMOND DIVISION,

George William Elliot.

CLEVELAND DIVISION,

Henry Fell Pease.

WHITBY DIVISION,

Ernest William Beckett.

East Riding,

HOLDERNESS DIVISION,

George Richard Bethell, R.N.

BUCKROSE DIVISION,

William Alexander McArthur.

HOWDENSHIRE DIVISION,

Arthur Duncombe.

West Riding, Northern Part,

SKIPTON DIVISION,

Walter Morrison.

KEIGHLEY DIVISION,

Isaac Holden.

SHIPLEY DIVISION,

Joseph Craven.

SOWERBY DIVISION,

Edward Crossley.

ELLAND DIVISION,

Thomas Wayman.

West Riding, Southern Part,

MORLEY DIVISION,

Charles George Milnes Gaskell.

NORMANTON DIVISION,

Benjamin Pickard.

COLNE VALLEY DIVISION,

Henry Frederick Beaumont.

HOLMFIRTH DIVISION,

Henry Joseph Wilson.

BARNSLEY DIVISION,

Courtney Stanhope Kenny.

HALLAMSHIRE DIVISION,

Frederick Thorpe Mappin.

ROTHERHAM DIVISION,

Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland.

DONCASTER DIVISION,

Walter Shirley Shirley.

YORK—*cont.*

West Riding, Eastern Part,

RIPON DIVISION,

John Lloyd Wharton.

OTLEY DIVISION,

John Barran.

BARKSTON ASH DIVISION,

Robert Gunter.

OSGOLDCROSS DIVISION,

John Austin.

PUDSEY DIVISION,

Briggs Priestley.

SPEN VALLEY DIVISION,

Joseph Woodhead.

BRADFORD BOROUGH.

West Division,

Alfred Illingworth.

Central Division,

Right Hon. John George Shaw-Lefevre.

East Division,

Henry Byron Reed.

DEWSBURY BOROUGH.

Sir John Simon, Serjeant-at-Law.

HALIFAX BOROUGH.

Thomas Shaw,
Rt. Hon. James Stansfeld.

HUDDERSFIELD BOROUGH.

William Sunmers.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL BOROUGH.

East Division,

Frederick Brent Grotrian.

Central Division,

Henry Seymour King.

West Division,

Charles Henry Wilson.

LEEDS BOROUGH.

North Division,

William Lawies Jackson.

Central Division,

Gerald William Balfour.

East Division,

John Lawrence Gane.

West Division,

Herbert John Gladstone.

South Division,

Rt. Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B.

MIDDLESBOROUGH BOROUGH.

Isaac Wilson.

YORK—*cont.*

PONTEFRACT BOROUGH.

Hon. Rowland Winn.

SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH.

Joshua Rowntree.

SHEFFIELD BOROUGH.

Attercliffe Division,

Hon. Bernard John Seymour Coleridge.

Brightside Division,

Rt. Hon. Anthony John Mundella.

Central Division,

Charles Edward Howard Vincent.

Hallam Division,

Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley.

Ecclesall Division,

Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett.

WAKEFIELD BOROUGH.

Sir Edward Green, bt.

YORK BOROUGH.

Alfred Edward Pease.
Frank Lockwood.

WALES.

ANGLESEA.

Thomas Lewis.

BRECKNOCK.

William Fuller Maitland.

CARDIGAN.

William Bowen Rowlands.

CARMARTHEN

EASTERN DIVISION,

David Pugh.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Walter Rice Howell Powell.

CARMARTHEN BOROUGH.

Sir Emile Algernon Arthur Keppel Cowell Stepney, bt.

CARNARVON.

SOUTHERN OR EIFION DIVISION,

John Bryn Roberts.

NORTHERN OR ARFON DIVISION,

William Rathbone.

CARNARVON BOROUGH.

Edmund Swetenham.

DENBIGH.

Eastern Division,

Rt. hon. George Osborne Morgan.

Western Division,

William Cornwallis West.

DENBIGH BOROUGH.

Hon. George Thomas Kenyon.

FLINT.

Samuel Smith.

FLINT BOROUGH.

John Roberts.

GLAMORGAN.

Eastern Division,

Alfred Thomas.

Rhondda Division,

William Abraham.

Western or Gower Division,

Frank Ash Yeo.

Mid Division,

Christopher Rice Mansel Talbot.

Southern Division,

Arthur John Williams.

CARDIFF BOROUGH.

Sir Edward James Reed, K.C.B.

MERTHYR TYDVIL BOROUGH.

Henry Richard,
Charles Herbert James.

SWANSEA BOROUGH.

Swansea Town,

Lewis Llewelyn Dillwyn.

Swansea District,

Sir Henry Hussey Vivian, bt.

MERIONETH.

Thomas Edward Ellis.

MONTGOMERY.

Stuart Rendel.

MONTGOMERY BOROUGH.

Hon. Frederick Stephen Archibald Hanbury-Tracy.

PEMBROKE.

William Davies.

PEMBROKE AND HAVERFORD WEST BOROUGH.

Rear Adm. Richard Charles Mayne

RADNOR.

Hon. Arthur Henry John Walsh.

SCOTLAND.

ABERDEEN.

Eastern Division,

Peter Esslemont.

Western Division,

Robert Farquharson, M.D.

ABERDEEN BURGH.

North Division.

William Alexander Hunter.

South Division,

James Bryce.

ARGYLL.

John Wingfield Malcolm.

AYR.

Northern Division,

Hon. Hugh Frederick Hislop Elliot.

Southern Division,

Hon. Greville Richard Vernon.

AYR DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Richard Frederick Fotheringham Campbell.

KILMARNOCK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Stephen Williamson.

BANFF.

Robert William Duff.

BERWICK.

Hon. Edward Marjoribanks.

BUTE.

James Patrick Bannerman Robertson.

CAITHNESS.

Gavin Brown Clark.

WICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Macdonald Cameron.

CLACKMANNAN AND KINROSS.

Rt. hon. John Blair Balfour.

DUMBARTON.

Sir Archibald Orr Ewing, bt.

DUMFRIES.

Sir Robert Jardine, bt.

DUMFRIES DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Threshie Reid.

EDINBURGH.

Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

EDINBURGH—*cont.*

EDINBURGH BURGH.

East Division,
Robert Wallace.

West Division,
Thomas Ryburn Buchanan.

Central Division,
William McEwan.

South Division,
Rt. Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers.

EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITIES.

Right Hon. John Hay Athole Macdonald, LL.D.

LEITH DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

ELGIN AND NAIRN.

Charles Henry Anderson.

ELGIN DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Alexander Asher.

FIFE.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Herbert Henry Asquith.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Hon. Robert Preston Bruce.

KIRKCALDY DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Sir George Campbell, knt.

ST. ANDREW'S DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Henry Torrens Anstruther.

FORFAR.

James William Barclay.

DUNDEE BURGH.

Edmund Robertson,
Charles Carmichael Lacaita.

MONTROSE DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Shiress Will.

HADDINGTON.

Richard Burdon Haldane.

INVERNESS.

Charles Fraser-Mackintosh.

INVERNESS DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Bannatyne Finlay.

KINCARDINE.

General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B.

KIRKCUDBRIGHT.

Mark John Stewart.

LANARK.

GOVAN DIVISION,
William Pearce.

PARTICK DIVISION,
Alexander Craig Sellar.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
Robert Bontine Cunningham Graham.

NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,
Donald Crawford.

MID DIVISION,
Stephen Mason.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
James Henry Cecil Hozier.

GLASGOW BURGH.

Bridgeton Division,
Edward Richard Russell.

Camlachie Division,
Hugh Watt.

St. Rollox Division,
James Caldwell.

Central Division,
John George Alexander Baird.

College Division,
Charles Cameron, M.D., LL.D.

Tradeston Division,
Archibald Cameron Corbett.

Blackfriars and Hutchesontown Division,
Andrew Dryburgh Provand.

GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN UNIVERSITIES.

James Alexander Campbell, LL.D.

LINLITHGOW.

Peter McLagan.

ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

Leonard Lyell.

PEEBLES AND SELKIRK

Walter Thorburn.

PERTH.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Robert Stewart Menzies.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Sir Donald Currie, K.C.M.G.

PERTH BURGH.

Charles Stuart Parker.

RENFREW.

Eastern Division,
Michael Hugh Shaw Stewart.

Western Division,
Sir Archibald Campbell Campbell, bt.

GREENOCK BURGH.
Thomas Sutherland.

PAISLEY BURGH.
William Boyle Barbour.

ROSS AND CROMARTY.

Roderick Macdonald.

ROXBURGH.

Hon. Arthur Ralph Douglas Elliot.

HAWICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
Alexander Laing Brown.

STIRLING.

Joseph Cheney Bolton.

FALKIRK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
William Pirrie Sinclair.

STIRLING DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

SUTHERLAND.

Angus Sutherland.

WIGTON.

Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, bt.

IRELAND.

ANTRIM.

North Antrim Division,
Edward Macnaghten.

Mid Antrim Division,
Hon. Robert Torrens O'Neill.

East Antrim Division,
James Martin M‘Calmont.

South Antrim Division,
William Grey Ellison Macartney.

BELFAST BOROUGH.
East Belfast Division,
Edward Samuel Wesley de Cobain.

South Belfast Division,
William Johnston.

West Belfast Division,
Thomas Sexton.

North Belfast Division,
William Ewart.

ARMAGH.

North Armagh Division,
Lieut.-Col. Edward James Saunderson.

Mid Armagh Division,
Sir James Porter Corry, bt.

South Armagh Division,
Alexander Blane.

CARLOW.

John Aloysius Blake.

CAVAN.

West Cavan Division,
Joseph Gillis Biggar.

East Cavan Division,
Thomas O'Hanlon.

CLARE.

East Clare Division,
Joseph Richard Cox.

West Clare Division,
Jeremiah Jordan.

CORK.

North Cork Division,
James Christopher Flynn.

North-East Cork Division,
Edmund Leamy.

Mid Cork Division,
Charles Kearns Deane Tanner.

East Cork Division,
William John Lane.

West Cork Division,
James Gilhooly.

South Cork Division,
Joseph Edward Kenny.

South-East Cork Division,
John Hooper.

CORK CITY.
Charles Stewart Parnell,
Maurice Healy.

DONEGAL.

North Donegal Division,
James Edward O'Doherty.

West Donegal Division,
Patrick O'Hea.

East Donegal Division,
Arthur O'Connor.

South Donegal Division,
Bernard Kelly.

DOWN.

North Down Division,

Lieut.-Col. Thomas Waring.

East Down Division,

Richard William Blackwood Ker.

West Down Division,

Lord Arthur Hill.

South Down Division,

Michael McCartan.

NEWRY BOROUGH.

Justin Huntly McCarthy.

DUBLIN.

North Dublin Division,

John Joseph Clancy, M.A.

South Dublin Division,

Sir Thomas Henry Grattan Esmonde.

DUBLIN CITY.

College Green Division,

Timothy Daniel Sullivan.

Dublin Harbour Division,

Timothy Charles Harrington.

St. Stephen's Green Division,

Edmond Dwyer Gray.

St. Patrick's Division,

William Martin Murphy.

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.

Rt. Hon. David Robert Plunket, LL.D.
Right Hon. Hugh Holmes.

FERMANAGH.

North Fermanagh Division,

William Hoey Kearney Redmond.

South Fermanagh Division,

Henry Campbell.

GALWAY.

Connemara Division,

Patrick James Foley.

North Galway Division,

John Philip Nolan.

East Galway Division,

Mathew Harris.

South Galway Division,

David Sheehy.

GALWAY TOWN.

John Pinkerton.

KERRY.

North Kerry Division,

John Stack.

West Kerry Division,

Edward Harrington.

South Kerry Division,

John O'Connor.

East Kerry Division,

Jeremiah Daniel Sheehan.

KILDARE.

North Kildare Division,

James Laurence Carew.

South Kildare Division,

James Leahy.

KILKENNY.

North Kilkenny Division,

Edward Mulhallen Marum.

South Kilkenny Division,

Patrick Alexander Chance.

KILKENNY CITY.

Thomas Dunn.

KING'S COUNTY.

Birr Division,

Bernard Charles Molloy.

Tullamore Division,

Joseph Francis Fox.

LEITRIM.

North Leitrim Division,

Michael Conway.

South Leitrim Division,

Luke Patrick Hayden.

LIMERICK.

West Limerick Division,

William Abraham.

East Limerick Division,

John Finucane.

LIMERICK CITY.

Henry Joseph Gill.

LONDONDERRY.

North Derry Division,

Henry Lyle Mulholland.

South Derry Division,

Thomas Lea.

LONDONDERRY CITY.

Charles Edward Lewis.

LONGFORD.

NORTH LONGFORD DIVISION,
Justin McCarthy.

SOUTH LONGFORD DIVISION,
Laurence Connolly.

LOUTH.

NORTH LOUTH DIVISION,
Joseph Nolan.

SOUTH LOUTH DIVISION,
Thomas Patrick Gill.

MAYO.

NORTH MAYO DIVISION,
Daniel Crilly.

WEST MAYO DIVISION,
John Deasy.

EAST MAYO DIVISION,
John Dillon.

SOUTH MAYO DIVISION,
James Frederick Xavier O'Brien.

MEATH.

NORTH MEATH DIVISION,
Pierce Mahony.

SOUTH MEATH DIVISION,
Edward Sheil.

MONAGHAN.

NORTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,
Patrick O'Brien.

SOUTH MONAGHAN DIVISION,
Sir Joseph Neale McKenna, knt.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.

OSSORY DIVISION,
William Archibald Macdonald.

LEIX DIVISION,
Richard Lalor.

ROSCOMMON.

NORTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,
James O'Kelly.

SOUTH ROSCOMMON DIVISION,
Andrew Commins.

SLIGO.

NORTH SLIGO DIVISION,
Peter McDonald.

SOUTH SLIGO DIVISION,
Thomas Sexton.

TIPPERARY.

NORTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,
Patrick Joseph O'Brien.

MID TIPPERARY DIVISION,
Thomas Mayne.

SOUTH TIPPERARY DIVISION,
John O'Connor.

EAST TIPPERARY DIVISION,
Thomas Joseph Condon.

TYRONE.

NORTH TYRONE DIVISION,
Lord Ernest Hamilton.

MID TYRONE DIVISION,
Matthew Joseph Kenny.

EAST TYRONE DIVISION,
William James Reynolds.

SOUTH TYRONE DIVISION,
Thomas Wallace Russell.

WATERFORD.

WEST WATERFORD DIVISION,
Jasper Douglas Pyne.

EAST WATERFORD DIVISION,
Patrick Joseph Power.

WATERFORD CITY.
Richard Power.

WESTMEATH.

NORTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,
James Tuite.

SOUTH WESTMEATH DIVISION,
Donal Sullivan.

WEXFORD.

NORTH WEXFORD DIVISION,
John Edward Redmond.

SOUTH WEXFORD DIVISION,
John Barry.

WICKLOW.

WEST WICKLOW DIVISION,
Garrett Michael Byrne.

EAST WICKLOW DIVISION,
William Joseph Corbet.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

First Session of the *Twenty-Fourth Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 5 August, 1886, in the Fiftieth
Year of the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIRST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

THE TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT of the United Kingdom—which had met for the despatch of Business on Tuesday, the 12th day of January, 1886, was prorogued on the 25th day of June to the 15th day of July; and, on the same day, was dissolved by Proclamation:—And Her Majesty therein declaring Her pleasure to call a new Parliament, directed Writs to be issued accordingly; which Writs were made returnable on Thursday, the 5th day of August.

The PARLIAMENT was opened by Commission.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 5th August, 1886.

The House of Peers being met,

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House,

"That Her Majesty, not thinking fit to be personally present here this day, has been pleased to cause a Commission to be issued under the Great Seal, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament."

Then Five of the Lords Commissioners—namely, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury); The Lord President of the Council (Viscount Cranbrook); The Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan); The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Earl of Iddesleigh); and The Lord Brabourne—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the Commons know "The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read."

Who being come,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"Her Majesty, not thinking fit to be present here to-day in Her Royal Person, hath been pleased, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament, to cause Letters Patent to be issued under the Great Seal, constituting us and several other Lords therein named Her Commissioners, to do all things in Her Majesty's name, on Her part necessary to be performed in this Parliament, and this will more fully appear by the Letters Patent themselves, which will now be read.

Then the said Letters Patent were read by the Clerk. And then

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"We have it in command from Her Majesty to let you know, that Her Majesty will, as soon as the Members of both Houses shall be sworn, declare the causes of Her calling this Parliament; and it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Commons shall be first chosen, it is Her Majesty's Pleasure that you, Gentlemen of the House of Commons, repair to the Place where you are to sit, and there proceed to the Choice of some proper Person to be your Speaker; and that you present such Person, whom you shall so choose, here, To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock, for Her Majesty's Royal Approbation."

Then the Commons withdrew.

Prayers.

The Lord Chancellor—Singly, in the first place, took the Oath at the Table.

Roll of the Lords—Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Certificate of the Election of Sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland — *Delivered*, and read, as follows:—

Earl of Mar.
,, Morton.
,, Mar and Kellie.
,, Strathmore and Kinghorn.
,, Haddington.
,, Lindsay.
Earl of Airlie.
,, Leven and Melville.
,, Northesk.
,, Dundonald.
,, Orkney.
Lord Forbes.
,, Sinclair.
,, Blantyre.
,, Balfour of Burleigh.
,, Polwarth.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 5*th August*, 1886.

The House met at Two of the clock; and, it being the first day of the meeting of this Parliament, pursuant to Proclamation, *Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave*, esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, *Archibald John Scott Milman*, and *Francis Broxholm Grey Jenkinson*, esquires, Clerks Assistant, attending in the House, and the other Clerks attending, according to their duty, *Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie*, esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in *Great Britain*, delivered to the said *Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave* a Book, containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

Several of the Members repaired to their Seats.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners by Black Rod;

The House went;—And a Commission having been read for opening and holding the Parliament, the Lords Commissioners directed the House to proceed to the Election of a Speaker, and present him To-morrow, at Twelve of the clock, in the House of Peers for the Royal Approbation.

And the House being returned;—

ELECTION OF A SPEAKER.

Sir EDWARD BIRKBECK (Norfolk, E.) (addressing himself to the Clerk, who, standing up, pointed to him, and then sat down)—Mr. Palgrave, in obedience to the gracious communication which we have just received from Her Majesty in "another place," it becomes the first duty of the House of Commons to proceed to the election of Speaker; and I feel it a special honour that I have been requested, on the present occasion, to propose as a candidate the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick and Leamington, feeling more than confident that the name of Mr. Arthur Peel will be received with the utmost cordiality and with the unanimous approval of the House. It is hardly necessary for me to refer to the past services of Mr. Peel in the Chair. They are well known to all hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who have had the honour of a seat during the last two Parliaments; and I am quite confident that one feeling is uppermost in their minds, and that is one of gratitude to him for the way in which he has fulfilled the arduous duties of the Chair in the past. But I would venture to say to those hon. Gentlemen who are about to take their seats for the first time in the House that they must have realized full well, as the outside public has done already, that Mr. Peel has fulfilled the arduous duties, the responsibilities, and the heavy burdens of the Chair with the greatest possible ability; and, further, that he has, on every occasion, shown the greatest impartiality and justice on all sides. He has, certainly — and the House will agree with me entirely when I say it—he has, certainly, a perfect knowledge of the traditions, the usages, and the forms of the House, and he has exhibited on all occasions the greatest possible self-possession, and the soundest judgment and ready decision. When appealed to upon any question as regards the Orders and Rules of the House, his ruling has met with the unanimous approval of the House; and any hon. Member who has had, from time to time, to seek his advice or assistance upon any occasion, has always received the greatest possible courtesy and kindness at the hands of Mr. Peel. In fact, I think I may say that Mr. Peel has, in the past, exceeded even the most sanguine expectations which were formed of him when he was first elected to the Chair, and I cannot conceive for one moment that the House of Commons can have one moment's hesitation on this occasion as regards the selection of a Speaker, when we have amongst us a tried and honoured right hon. Gentleman, who has proved himself on all occasions not only able but most anxious to uphold the dignity and to protect the time-honoured Privileges of this House. In proposing Mr. Peel as Speaker, I believe I am doing so in strict accordance with former precedents, and also, as I have said before, with the unanimous approval of the House of Commons. It has been said, on a former occasion, by a Prime Minister in this House, that the Speaker of the House of Commons ought to have the purity of an English Judge and the spirit of an English gentleman. These qualities, I most unhesitatingly say, Mr. Peel possesses most undoubtedly in every possible respect. I believe him to be the most eminently qualified Member that we have amongst us to occupy the important capacity of Speaker, and I hope most earnestly that his health and strength may long be spared to enable him to occupy the Chair, and that he may be willing to do so with the approval of the House, in an Assembly that we and the nation are so justly proud of. It is out of no disrespect to the House, or to Mr. Peel, that I do not speak at greater length on this occasion, because the House will feel with me that it would be most difficult to say what one would really wish to say in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman; and I believe I am right in saying that it is his own wish that the proceedings of to-day should be as brief as possible. Therefore, Mr. Palgrave, I have only now to move—"That the Right honourable Arthur Wellesley Peel do take the Chair of this House as Speaker."

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Midlothian, and Leith): I desire, Mr. Palgrave, to second the nomination which has just been made, and I concur altogether in the sentiments which the hon. Member who preceded me (Sir Edward Birkbeck) has very well expressed. There was a time, Sir, when the chief function of the Speaker was to defend the Privileges of this House against external attack. Dangers of that kind have passed away, and the chief function of the Speaker—one may say almost practically the exclusive function of the Speaker—is to defend the House against itself—that is, to vindicate its authority against any individual Member who may not be sufficiently sensible of his duty. And that function, I am afraid, Sir, in modern times, has become still more arduous and difficult than was the original office of defence against aggression, which, in former times, constituted the chief characteristic of the place that he holds. But, Sir, on this occasion, as the hon. Member has well said, we are not dealing with an untried man, and we are not dealing with new circumstances, inasmuch as though the Parliament be new, yet I believe the disposition of all Members who have sat in former Parliaments, and the disposition of those who are now taking their seats for the first time, is alike unanimously favourable to the high claims of Mr. Peel. We feel, Sir, that he has fully answered the expectations that were formed of him at the time when he was first invited to take the Chair. We require, indeed, much from our Speaker. We require from him knowledge and application. We require that he shall combine the greatest tact with the greatest decision. We require from him a singular degree of readiness and a singular degree of exactness. These things are not always so easily united; but, above all, we ask from him temper and a judicial mind. I cannot help offering one remark of congratulation, both to my right hon. Friend and likewise to the constituency that he represents, with respect to the peculiarity of his position. It appears to me to be a remarkable example of discretion on his own part—which can surprise no one—and likewise of forbearance and of discretion on the part of his constituents, that he should not have been called upon, on the occasion of the recent Election, to enter into the details of the sharpest of all controversies which at present exist among us, but that those whom he represents should have been entirely satisfied with his references to his former conduct, and former declarations at periods removed from the present time. I cannot but feel, Sir, that in that conduct and forbearance of his constituents my right hon. Friend will have a new and special advantage in the discharge of a most difficult part of his functions. We must not conceal from ourselves that the functions of Speaker in this House are rendered much more difficult at a period when, instead of being sharply and simply divided into two political Parties, between themselves making up the whole House, the House at present is rather—for a time it may be, but undoubtedly for the time—broken rather into sections. With respect to one of these sections in particular, it has been its unhappy fortune, from causes I need not dwell upon, to find itself in conflict at most periods with a majority of the House, at some periods almost with the whole of it, and at all periods with a large and important part of it; and to administer justice to a small Party thus situated is, no doubt, an office of extreme difficulty and of extreme responsibility. Nor is it possible to give a stronger proof of the highest confidence in the possession by my right hon. Friend of all the qualities needed for a Speaker—and for a distinguished Speaker—than it is if we can feel, as I, for one, entirely feel, that in doing justice even in a case so peculiar as that, my right hon. Friend is entirely qualified and will succeed in the great task in which he is about to embark. It is quite unnecessary for me to enter further upon this question. I congratulate my right hon. Friend on the acknowledgment of his past services—the marked acknowledgment of those services which he is now receiving from the apparently unanimous disposition of the House of Commons again to mark its confidence in him by bestowing upon him the very highest honour in its power. At the same time, it is taking undoubtedly on its own behalf the very best security it is possible for it to take for preserving its dignity, its order, and the efficiency of its work. I beg, Sir, to second the Motion.

The House then unanimously calling Mr. PEEL to the Chair,

MR. PEEL stood up in his place and said: Mr. Palgrave, I think I shall be best consulting the convenience of the House if, on the present occasion, I address it in the fewest and simplest terms. But I should, first of all, wish to discharge an obligation which I readily own, and most readily pay, to the hon. Baronet the Member for East Norfolk (Sir Edward Birkbeck), and to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) for the terms in which they have spoken of myself, and for the manner in which they have submitted my name to the judgment and arbitrament of the House. I say that I shall use but few words on this occasion. It will not I hope be supposed—I hope it will be an impossible supposition—that if I say but little I shall at all undervalue the honour that is involved in the bestowal of the dignity of that Chair, or that I, in any way, underrate the great responsibilities which attach to that position. No, Sir; my reason for speaking briefly is this—that if it should be the pleasure of the House to elect me to-day to fill that Chair, I shall have been within the short space of seven months twice elected to that dignity, and I shall have been three times within 30 months chosen as Speaker of this House. Not, Sir, that the repetition of that honour in any way blunts my sense of it, or that I feel less deeply grateful to the House and every Member in it for this bestowal of the dignity and this mark of their approval. I have the honour of addressing new Members, as well as those who have sat in previous Parliaments. There are many new Members in this House — not so many as so markedly signalized and characterized the constitution of the last Parliament—but if I may be permitted to address myself for a moment to those new Members, I would say that if, in the course of my occupation of the Office of the Chair, I have gained any experience, such experience as I possess is entirely at their service for the purpose of facilitating their acquaintance with the technical Rules, Forms, and Proceedings of this House. And while I offer to new Members, as to old, what little help I may be able to render them in that way, I, on my part, make an appeal to new Members as well as to old—an appeal which I should only be justified in making to-day on the supposition that it is the pleasure of the House to elect me. The appeal, Sir, is this—that they will maintain, as it is the interest of every man among us to maintain, the dignity and authority of the Chair. It may be necessary, in the course of time, to adapt our technical and written Rules and Proceedings to the changing circumstances of the day. I have nothing to say to what may be the pleasure of the House in that respect; but I appeal to all Members alike to observe, not only the written Rules, which may from time to time be changed, but those conventionalities and usages which are amongst the proudest heritages of the House of Commons. Sir, if we observe those Rules—if we observe the best spirit of those traditions, we shall be obtaining the best guarantee and security for the maintenance of freedom of debate, and we shall be doing what in us lies to promote to the utmost that which tends alike to individual and to collective liberty. Sir, I shall say no more upon this occasion, but humbly place myself entirely at the disposal of the judgment of the House of Commons.

The House then again unanimously calling Mr. PEEL to the Chair, he was taken out of his place by the said Sir EDWARD BIRKBECK and the said Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE, and conducted to the Chair.

Then MR. SPEAKER ELECT, standing on the upper step, said: Standing once again in this place by the favour of the House, I desire to repeat my deep acknowledgments to the House for the honour which they have done me, and to assure them that as long as health and strength are given me I shall endeavour to maintain the Privileges of this House, and study to the utmost to promote its interests.

And then the Mace, which before lay under the Table, was now laid upon the Table. Then—

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. W. L. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) rose, and said:—Sir, in the unavoidable absence of my noble Friend who is to lead this House (Lord Randolph Churchill), and in the absence of many distinguished men who sit on this side of the House, and owing to the accident of circumstances which I need not explain, the great honour has fallen upon me to tender to you, Sir, in the name of the Members of this House, our most hearty congratulations on your re-appointment to that Chair. Sir, you have to-day been appointed to the highest Office which it is in the power of this House to bestow. You have been appointed by the unanimous voice of the House. You have been appointed for the third time to that position which you now occupy. On the occasion of your first appointment, a most favourable estimate was made of the manner in which you would discharge the duties of your important and responsible position; and those who have had the privilege of sitting in the last and the preceding Parliaments have been told by experience that the estimate which was then formed has since been fully and completely fulfilled. Sir, you were appointed at a time when the work was most arduous, and sometimes exceedingly difficult. You were appointed in the place of one who had filled with distinguished ability that Chair for many years—one of whom I may say that he had won, in a remarkable degree, the confidence and affection of every Member of this House. Sir, the position which you occupy must always be a difficult one. It is rendered none the less difficult, may I say, with all respect to those who now fill the position, by the loss of one—the late Lord Farnborough—who sat at this Table for so many years, and who possessed in a singular and remarkable degree information and knowledge as to the Forms of the House, which were always at the disposal not only of the Members of the House, but of the Speaker for the time being. Sir, the position which you fill can only be filled satisfactorily, if it is filled by one possessing the confidence of the Members of this House, and by one who is assured of the support of the Members of this House. Sir, your unanimous re-appointment to that position is sufficient proof of the confidence of the Members; and I will venture on their behalf to say that in the position which you now occupy you will have the full and complete and cordial support of every Member of this House. To you, Sir, is entrusted the guardianship of the undoubted Rights and Privileges of every Member of the House. It is because we believe that you will maintain with dignity those Rights and Privileges, and it is because of our confidence in your strict impartiality, judgment, and decision, that we have the greatest satisfaction in your re-appointment. Although the honour which has fallen upon me is one I extremely value, and although I am conscious of the imperfect and inadequate expression which I have given to the voice of the Members of this House, I none the less sincerely and most earnestly, in their name and on their behalf, tender to you our hearty and warmest congratulations.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS) (Kent, St. Augustine's): I beg to move that this House do now adjourn, and in making that Motion I wish to state that the House will meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock for the approbation of Mr. Speaker Elect, and for the swearing in of Members; and it is proposed that at 4 o'clock a second Message should come down from the other House authorizing the issue of new Writs. That Message will be drafted in such a way that the new Writs can be moved at once.

Mr. SPEAKER ELECT put the Question, which, being agreed to,—

The House was adjourned accordingly, and Mr. SPEAKER ELECT went away with the Mace before him.

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock till To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 6th August, 1886.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

The Lords Commissioners — namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury); The LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount Cranbrook); The LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl Cadogan); The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Earl of Iddesleigh); and The LORD BRABOURNE—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the Commons know "The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House."

And the Commons being at the Bar:—

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PRESENTED AND APPROVED.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL, Speaker Elect, said—

"MY LORDS,

"I have to acquaint your Lordships, that Her Majesty's most faithful Commons, in obedience to Her Majesty's commands, and in the exercise of their undoubted rights and privileges, have proceeded to the Election of a Speaker, and that their choice has fallen upon myself, and I now present myself at your Lordships' Bar, and submit myself with all humility for Her Majesty's gracious approbation."

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"Mr. Peel,

"We are commanded to assure you that Her Majesty is so fully sensible of your zeal for the public service, and of your ample sufficiency to execute the rights and duties which Her Majesty's faithful Commons have selected you to discharge, that She does most readily approve and confirm you as their Speaker."

Then Mr. SPEAKER said—

"My Lords,

"I submit myself with all humility to Her Majesty's gracious commands. It is now my duty, in the name and on behalf of the Commons of the United Kingdom, to lay claim by humble Petition to Her Majesty, to all their undoubted rights and privileges; especially to freedom of speech in debate; to freedom from arrest of their persons and servants; and, above all, to freedom of access to Her Majesty whenever occasion shall require. For myself, if any error should be committed, I pray it may be imputed to me alone, and not to Her Majesty's faithful Commons."

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR said,

"Mr. Speaker,

"We have it further in command to inform you that Her Majesty does most readily confirm all the rights and privileges which have ever been granted to or conferred upon the Commons by any of Her Royal Predecessors.

"With respect to yourself, Sir, though Her Majesty is sensible that you stand in no need of such assurance, Her Majesty will ever put the most favourable construction upon your words and actions."

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

SAT FIRST.

The Viscount Melville, after the death of his uncle.

The Lord Penrhyn, after the death of his father.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

NEW WRITS.

The Lords Commissioners—namely, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury); The Lord Coleridge; The Marquess of Huntly; The Viscount Barrington; and The Lord Sudeley;—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the Commons know "The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House."

And the Commons being at the Bar:—

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"We have it further in command from Her Majesty to acquaint you that, since the time when Her Majesty deemed it right to call you together, for the consideration of many grave and important matters, several vacancies have occurred in the House of Commons, owing to the acceptance of Office from the Crown by Members of that House, or from other causes. It is therefore Her Majesty's pleasure that an opportunity may now be given to issue Writs for supplying the vacancies so occasioned, and that, after a suitable Recess, you may proceed to the consideration of such matters as will then be laid before you.

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Thursday the 19th instant, One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 6*th August*, 1886.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

The House being met, and Mr. SPEAKER ELECT having taken the Chair, a Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

"MR. SPEAKER,

"The Lords, authorized by virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, desire the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the House of Peers."

Accordingly, Mr. SPEAKER ELECT, with the House, went up to the House of Peers, where he was presented to the said Lords Commissioners for the Royal Approbation.

Then THE LORD CHANCELLOR, one of the said Lords Commissioners, signified Her Majesty's approbation of Mr. Speaker Elect.

And the House being returned;—

MR. SPEAKER (standing in his usual place) said: I have to report to the House that, in the House of Peers, Her Majesty, by Her Royal Commissioners, has been pleased to approve the choice made of myself to the Office of your Speaker, and that I have, in your name and on your behalf, laid claim by humble Petition to Her Majesty to all your ancient and undoubted Rights and Privileges—freedom of speech in debate, freedom from arrest of your persons and servants, and, particularly, of free access to Her Majesty whenever occasion may require, and that the most favourable construction may be placed upon all your proceedings. All these, Her Majesty, by Her Commissioners, has been pleased to grant and confirm, in as ample a manner as they have ever been granted and confirmed by Her Majesty, or by any of Her Royal Predecessors.

My duty now is again to repeat my deep acknowledgments to the House for the honour conferred upon me in again placing me in this Chair. I wish to repeat my acknowledgments to the House, and again to express my sense of the obligations they have imposed upon me. It only remains for me now to invite hon. Members to come to the Table to take the Oath of Allegiance, and subscribe the Roll in the usual form; and in doing this I may be permitted to call the attention of hon. Members to a Paper which has been issued containing instructions (with the purpose of facilitating the Business). If hon. Members will kindly follow them and consent to the arrangement, I am sure it will facilitate the despatch of Business to-day and on following days.

Mr. SPEAKER then took and subscribed the Oath, first alone; and after him several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported*, That the Lords Commissioners under the Great Seal for opening and holding this Parliament, had made a Communication to both Houses, which Mr. Speaker read to the House, as follows:—

My Lords and Gentlemen,

We have it further in command from Her Majesty to acquaint you that, since the time when Her Majesty deemed it right to call you together, for the consideration of many grave and important matters, several vacancies have occurred in the House of Commons owing to the acceptance of Office from the Crown by Members of that House.

It is therefore Her Majesty's pleasure that an opportunity may now be given to issue Writs for supplying the vacancies so occasioned, and that, after a suitable Recess, you may proceed to the consideration of such matters as will then be laid before you.

ELECTIONS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if any thing shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate; and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

NEW WRITS.

For—

Paddington (South Division), *v.* Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bristol (Western Division), *v.* Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Birmingham (East Division), *v.* Right honble. Henry Matthews, Secretary of State.

Strand, *v.* Right honble. William Henry Smith, Secretary of State.

South West Lancashire (Newton Division), *v.* Right honble. Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., Secretary of State.

Lincoln County (South Lindsey Division), *v.* Right honble. Edward Stanhope, Secretary of State.

Middlesex (Ealing Division), *v.* Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton, First Commissioner to the Admiralty.

Leicester County (Eastern Division), *v.* Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Manchester (Eastern Division), *v.* Right honble. Arthur James Balfour, Secretary for Scotland.

Hampstead, *v.* Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education.

Tower Hamlets (Saint George's Division), *v.* Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie, President of the Local Government Board.

Dublin University, *v.* Right honble. David Robert Plunket, First Commissioner of Works.

Cambridge University, *v.* Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes, Postmaster General.

Isle of Wight, *v.* Sir Richard Everard Webster, Attorney General.

Plymouth, *v.* Edward George Clarke, esquire, Solicitor General.

Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews, *v.* Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald, Lord Advocate of Scotland.

Bute County, *v.* James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire, Solicitor General for Scotland.

Dublin University, *v.* Right honble. Hugh Holmes, Attorney General for Ireland.

Liverpool (Walton Division), *v.* John George Gibson, esquire, Solicitor General for Ireland.

Brighton, *v.* Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott, Judge Advocate General.

Devon County (North East Division), *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond, Commissioner of the Treasury.

Croydon, *v.* Honble. Sidney Herbert, Commissioner of the Treasury.

Wigtown County, *v.* Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet, Commissioner of the Treasury.

Marylebone (East Division), *v.* Captain the honble. Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford, Commissioner of the Admiralty.

Sheffield (Ecclesall Division), *v.* Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, esquire, Commissioner of the Admiralty.

Down County (West Division), *v.* Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill, Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household.

Middlesex County (Enfield Division), *v.* Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone, Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household.

Lewisham, *v.* Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham, Vice Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household.

Then several other Members took and subscribed the Oath.

House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock till Monday next at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 9*th August*, 1886.

The House met at Two of the clock.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath required by Law.

DOUBLE RETURN.

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that he had received a Letter from the Right honourable William Ewart Gladstone, returned as Member for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), and also for the Borough of Leith, making his election to serve for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), as followeth:—

H. of Commons,
Aug. 9, '86.

My dear Mr. Speaker,

I take the liberty of apprising you that, having been returned to Parliament for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), and also for the Borough of Leith, I elect to serve for the County of Edinburgh, or Midlothian.

I have the honour to be
Most faithfully yours,
W. E. Gladstone.

Right Hon. The Speaker of the
House of Commons.

NEW WRITS.

For—

Leith, *v.* The Right honble. William Ewart Gladstone, who, having been returned for the said Borough of Leith and for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), hath elected to sit for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian).

Staffordshire (Burton Division), *v.* Sir Michael A. Bass, baronet, Manor of Northstead.

House adjourned at Four o'clock till One o'clock To-morrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 10*th August*, 1886.

The House met at One of the clock.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath required by Law.

NEW WRITS.

For—

North Lancashire (Blackpool Division), *v.* The Right honble. Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., President of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Plantations.

Northampton County (North Division), *v.* The honble. Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley, one of the Grooms in Waiting on Her Majesty.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Thursday 19th August.

House adjourned at Four o'clock till Thursday 19th August.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 19*th August*, 1886.

Prayers.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

The Commons being at the Bar, with their Speaker, the Lord Chancellor delivered Her Majesty's Speech to both Houses of Parliament, as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I have summoned you to meet at this unusual season of the year for the transaction of indispensable business.

"The Session of the last Parliament was interrupted before the ordinary work of the year had been completed, in order that the sense of my people might be taken on certain important proposals with regard to the government of Ireland. The result of that appeal has been to confirm the conclusion to which the late Parliament had come.

"The provisional nature of the arrangement which was made by the last Parliament for the public charge of the year renders it inexpedient to postpone any further the consideration of the necessary financial legislation.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"The Estimates which were submitted to the last Parliament, and were only partially voted, will be laid before you.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"At a period of the year usually assigned for the recess, and after the prolonged and exceptional labours to which many of you have been subjected, I abstain from recommending now, for your consideration, any measures except those which are essential to the conduct of the public service during the remaining portion of the financial year. I am confident that they will receive your prompt and careful attention.

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR SCOTLAND.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had received (by post) from the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland, Minutes of the meeting held on the 20th of July last of the Peers of Scotland for the election of their representatives to sit and vote in the ensuing Parliament of the United Kingdom; and also, Return by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland concerning Titles of Peerages called at the said meeting, in right of which respectively no vote had been received and counted for fifty years last past as at the date of the said meeting: The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Several Lords—took the Oath.

NEW PEERS.

The Right Honourable William John Lord Monson having been created Viscount Oxenbridge of Burton in the county of Lincoln—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Michael Arthur Bass, Baronet, having been created Baron Burton of Rangemore and of Burton-upon-Trent, both in the county of Stafford—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Thomas Brassey, K.C.B., having been created Baron Brassey of Bulkeley in the county of Chester—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Sir Henry Thring, K.C.B., having been created Baron Thring of Alderhurst in the county of Surrey—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SELECT VESTRIES.

Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1^a.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—QUESTION.

EARL **GRANVILLE**: I wish to ask the noble Marquess opposite (the Prime Minister), seeing that there is no doubt whatever that the Address will be carried by your Lordships this evening, what the Government proposes to do with regard to the future Business of this House?

THE **PRIME MINISTER** (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My impression is that there will be no Business coming up from the House of Commons within the next 10 days. I do not think, therefore, that any useful purpose will be served by forcing noble Lords to come here when there is no Business to transact; and I should, unless the noble Earl objects, propose to move that the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Monday week.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The QUEEN'S SPEECH *reported* by The LORD CHANCELLOR.

THE EARL OF **ONSLOW** (LORD IN WAITING) (who wore the uniform of a Deputy Lord Lieutenant): In rising to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty in response to the gracious Speech from the Throne I feel that I stand in a position of unusual difficulty. There are two reasons for that. In the first place, I am unable to claim from your Lordships that measure of indulgence which has invariably been accorded by you to young Members of the House who have risen to address it for the first time. I recollect also how, not more than six years ago, your Lordships were kind enough to extend to me similar kindness. And, in the second place, I crave indulgence because the Address I have to move is founded upon a text of unusual shortness and brevity. It is said that "Happy is the country that has no history, and the nation whose annals are dull;" and if that is true of a country, it may well be believed to be true of a Queen's Speech which contains no reference to foreign relations, because it proves how satisfactory are its relations with Foreign Powers, and that, at least, there is no subject engrossing the attention of the Government in regard to foreign affairs which is of such importance as to necessitate the calling of the special attention of Parliament to it. I venture to think that that is in some measure due to the very able and successful conduct of foreign affairs, during the tenure of Office of the late Government, by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Rosebery), who represented that Department. I think it is no disparagement to the noble Earl to say that he has followed successfully the principles laid down by his Predecessor, who now, in his turn, has formed an Administration of his own, to succeed that of which the noble Earl was a shining ornament. The highest praise, I think, that can be accorded to the noble Earl is to say that, by adopting those principles, he has given a unity and consistency to our foreign policy which has raised this country in the estimation of the diplomatists of the world, and which, owing to the peculiarity of Party Government in this country, has unfortunately, of late years, been too seldom found to exist.

Now, it cannot have escaped the observation of your Lordships, in reading the Queen's Gracious Speech from the Throne, that there is a singular and significant absence of any reference to the future policy of the Government towards Ireland; but I cannot believe that there is any Member of your Lordships' House who will think that that omission is in consequence of any want of feeling on the part of Her Majesty's Government as to the due importance which attaches to the very unfortunate state of affairs existing in that Island. The Speech shows, in my opinion, that Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the dangers and difficulties of the present situation in Ireland. The appeal which was recently made to the country placed before the people of England a scheme which has already been before Parliament; and the voice of the country has pronounced, in no uncertain tone, against the scheme of the late Government with reference to the future government of Ireland. It therefore rests with Her Majesty's present Government to propound some alternative which will be agreeable to the newly-elected Parliament. I believe one reason why there is no mention of this and many other important matters in the Queen's Speech is because Her Majesty's Government are anxious to wind up the affairs of the Session with as much expedition and as little controversy as possible. I will shortly call attention to what have been the duties of Parliament and of Members of Parliament during the last two years. In 1884 the Parliament met on the 7th of February, and it sat till the 14th of August in that year. It adjourned until the 23rd of October, when it met again and sat till the 6th of December. It met again on the 19th of February, 1885, and sat until the 14th of August in that year. Then supervened the General Election of 1885, which kept Members of the other House of Parliament before their constituencies, and unable to enjoy their well-earned leisure, during the whole of the latter months of 1885. On the 12th of January, 1886, the new Parliament met, and sat until the Dissolution in June last, after which supervened again the work and the worry of another General Election. I think that, seeing how the country has been kept in a ferment of political excitement, it is not too much to expect that the great majority of its Members must be anxious to be released from their duties. Another reason why it is highly desirable that the Session should be wound up with the greatest expedition is because Her Majesty's Government have fallen on a task of no ordinary magnitude—namely, to frame and propound a policy for the future government of Ireland.

I venture to think that it is of the last importance that Ministers should not be distracted by those questions and influences which are inseparable from their career during the Session of Parliament. It may be said that noble Lords who sit on the Treasury Bench have so recently occupied the places of Ministers of the Crown that they ought to be able to formulate a policy for the government of Ireland immediately, and at once. To those I would point out what is the political situation now, and what it was then. Then they were faced by a hostile majority in Parliament, composed of the unbroken and undivided ranks of the Liberal Party, and also of those who represented the Nationalists of Ireland. The late Government, on the other hand, depended for its existence upon the support of Mr. Parnell and his followers. Now that has been greatly changed. Her Majesty's Government no longer depend upon Members of the late Administration, nor do they depend upon the goodwill of Mr. Parnell; but they do look for support to a number of noble Lords opposite, and of Gentlemen in the other House of Parliament and throughout the country, representing—I think I shall not be exaggerating when I say the flower of the Liberal Party—those who are called the Liberal Unionists, and who, rather than look back to the records of the past for their political reputation, are anxious to look forward to what should be the record of the future for maintaining that honesty and uprightness which have always been the leading characteristics of our Legislators. That being so, I think I shall not be out of place in asking those Members of your Lordships' House who sit on the other side, and who are Liberal Unionists, to give their support to the Government and to me in moving the adoption of the Address, in order that Her Majesty's Government may have ample time and opportunity, during the coming months, to consider the legislation which they should adopt towards Ireland, and so to support the Government in doing that which they believe to be best for that country, as well as for the general well-being of the United Kingdom. My Lords, I beg to move this humble Address in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne.

Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to your Majesty for the gracious Speech which your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that Your Majesty has summoned us to meet at this unusual season of the year for the transaction of indispensable business.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that the Session of the last Parliament was interrupted before the ordinary work of the year had been completed, in order that the sense of Your Majesty's people might be taken on certain important proposals with regard to the government of Ireland; and that the result of that appeal has been to confirm the conclusion to which the late Parliament had come.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that the provisional nature of the arrangement which was made by the last Parliament for the public charge of the year renders it inexpedient to postpone any further the consideration of the necessary financial legislation.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that at a period of the year usually assigned for the recess, and after the prolonged and exceptional labours to which many of us have been subjected, Your Majesty abstains from recommending now, for our consideration, any measures except those which are essential to the conduct of the public service during the remaining portion of the financial year.

"We humbly assure Your Majesty that such measures shall receive our prompt and careful attention."

Lord DE ROS (Lord in Waiting) (who was attired in the Lévee dress of a Lord of the Bedchamber), in rising to second the Motion, said: Although the noble Earl has left me very little to say, I feel I should be wanting in courtesy to the House if I did not, in a very few words, allude to what has been justly called the burning subject of the day—namely, the present condition of Ireland. Ever since the Land Act of 1881, which, by the way, was supposed to be a panacea for everything that was evil in Ireland, that country has been in the most unsettled condition; and that Act has satisfied no one, but, on the contrary, has had the effect of straining the relations between landlord and tenant to the utmost point. It has also given rise to the formation of one of the most formidable organizations which has been known in modern days—I mean the Land League, which, being gradually merged into the National League, received, to so great a degree, the powerful support of the late Prime Minister and the late Government when in Office. Happily, the verdict of this country, at the last General Election, pronounced most decidedly against its pernicious doctrines, and more particularly against that doctrine which advocated the disruption of the Empire. I feel certain, therefore, that the announcement made a short time ago by a prominent Member of the present Ministry that it was their determination to administer the present ordinary law with firmness and decision, and, if that action should not prove sufficient, to resort to such extraordinary measures as they might consider advisable for the maintenance of peace and order in Ireland—I feel sure those sentiments will be received with the greatest satisfaction by all law-abiding persons in Ireland.

I cannot pass over the unfortunate circumstances which have taken place lately in Belfast. Being a resident in that part of the country, naturally that is one of the subjects most prominent in my mind. It has illustrated beyond anything the very strong Party feeling which exists in that part of the country. As I understand that a judicial investigation is about to take place upon the subject in general, it would be improper in me to pronounce my opinion as to the original cause of those riots. But I may say that I am clearly of opinion—and I know it is the general opinion of the magistrates and gentry in my neighbourhood—that one of the main causes of those unfortunate outbreaks was the permission of Party processions with bands and flags and banners. It is well known that the beat of a drum excites the Irishman to such a degree that he loses all control over his actions. I think it very unfortunate that a large force of Irish Constabulary was, under the late Government, drafted into Belfast from the country; and I believe the conduct of some of those men is open to severe criticism, and I sincerely trust that an investigation on oath will be taken upon their conduct, as well as upon the general subject of the riots. The first act of the present Chief Secretary for Ireland was to summon the Mayor of Belfast to Dublin, in order to obtain his views as to the best means of suppressing the riots; and I cannot help thinking that, if that had been done in the first instance, a very great deal of bloodshed might have been stopped. In conclusion, I may say that every topic in the Queen's Speech has been exhausted by the noble Earl who moved the Address, and it only remains for me to reiterate the hope with which the noble Earl concluded his speech. I beg to second the Motion that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty.—[See *page* 26.]

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I have some doubt as to whether, considering the unusual circumstances of our meeting, it is desirable that I should adhere to the custom of rising after the Mover and Seconder of the Address; but, although I certainly do not intend to trouble your Lordships at any length, I shall endeavour to make a speech, following the example of brevity which Her Majesty has been advised to adopt. I think that if I speak now, it may, as I desire, give the noble Marquess the Prime Minister the advantage of the best opportunity for making that statement which I have no doubt he is desirous to make to your Lordships and to Parliament generally. My Lords, I have said there are unusual circumstances connected with our meeting. In the first place, there is no doubt that there have seldom been such rapid changes of Administration as have lately taken place. In reading some remarks which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack (Lord Halsbury) made to certain dames of the Primrose League with regard to the great disadvantages of rapid changes of Government, it just struck me that those remarks might have had still more weight if the noble and learned Lord had made them a month before the change of Government took place, and he came into Office, instead of a month after. But I very much agree with the noble and learned Lord. I have no doubt that, under representative institutions, it is most desirable that there should be occasional changes of Government, and that each great Party in the State should have an opportunity of acquiring official experience, and of obtaining the sense of official responsibility. There is no doubt that if these changes take place too quickly it is a disadvantage, and I am afraid it is one of these things which individuals cannot control, but of which it may be said—"Man may propose, but God alone can dispose." There is another unusual thing, and this is with regard to the time of our meeting; and I only wish, upon this subject, to point out that the promise to meet as early as this was absolutely conditional, and was only done to dispel any unworthy suspicion that we wished to cling to Office after the decision of the constituencies had declared against us. It was perfectly open to Her Majesty's Government to have taken more time, if they thought it necessary, for the consideration of measures, and to call Parliament together before the winter began, and in time to meet all the financial requirements of the nation. Well, I think I need not point out how singularly meagre the Queen's Speech and the Address in answer to it are; that has been very well done for me by the two noble Lords who have spoken; and now I may say one word with regard to the noble Earl who moved and the noble and gallant Lord who seconded the Address. It has been very often my fate of late years to have the privilege—with few exceptions, and with perfect sincerity—to compliment the noble Lords who have moved and seconded the Address, particularly when those noble Lords were young Peers, and were about thus to make their first essay in coming before the notice of your Lordships. Now, it would be unbecoming for me to compliment two respected and popular Members of this House, whom I have often listened to with interest and pleasure, with regard to the manner in which they have performed their task; but I cannot conceal my admiration at the skill with which they have imitated, and I may say have far surpassed, the ancient Egyptians in being able to make bricks without the trace of a straw. The want of material for a speech has created a difficulty. We all know the large number of independent supporters who follow the noble Marquess opposite; and I suppose that fact made it impossible for him to persuade any one of them to move or second this particular Address, and obliged him to impose a duty in a very novel manner upon two salaried Members of the Government. The noble Earl (the Earl of Onslow) was obliged, in order to make a speech, to go outside the records of the Queen's Speech, and so much so, that I can hardly follow him in all the remarks he has made. The subjects of India and the Colonies, however, have occupied, and require, public attention very much of late; yet there is not one word about them in the Queen's Speech. With regard to India, there are some very important questions. I only hope, in alluding to these, to induce the noble Marquess to give us some information on the subject. I mean with regard to the state of Burmah. The annexation of Burmah was inaugurated by the late Government of the noble Marquess. We took over the policy as we found it; but there are reports which I should mention, in the hope that he will be able to minimize them, tending to support the argument which the noble Marquess near me raised against the expedition to Burmah, and the statements which I myself made, that the noble Marquess's late Administration rather underrated the difficulties of their task. With regard to the Colonies, I read a speech the other day by the noble Marquess on the question of Imperial federation; and, if he will allow me to say so, I was very much struck with the justice and good sense of that speech, and the appreciation he seemed so justly to have formed, on the one hand, of the feelings and sentiments of the Colonists in regard to the matter; and, on the other hand, of their practical opinions on the subject. With regard to foreign affairs, the noble Earl who moved the Address said the omission of any reference to foreign affairs showed that there is nothing occurring at this moment of a critical nature. I trust the noble Marquess will be able to confirm that statement. The noble Marquess did make a speech at the Mansion House the other day, in which he touched with a light hand upon the immortality of the Afghan and Egyptian Questions, although I may point out that more than a year ago we were severely censured for not having solved them. On these matters I trust he will have some reassuring information to give us to-night.

My Lords, there is one question referred to by the noble Earl which is excluded from the Speech, or, rather, which is alluded to in so faint a manner as to be practically excluded. I mean the question of Ireland; and I cannot help thinking that, in asking the noble Marquess, who is likely to follow me, to give us a general—without detail—and clear indication of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, I am not doing anything but giving expression to the desire of both sides of the House. I remember Lord Lansdowne, who was so long and well known as the Leader of this House, saying that a noble Earl from the Sister Island, when sitting in Committee by him, used, after putting a question, the remark that he put the question because he knew the answer. I am bound to say I am not in the position of that noble Earl. I have no idea of the answer, or of what is the policy of the present Government in regard to Ireland. In order, in some degree, to enlighten my ignorance on this point I have been studying the utterances made by some of the most important Members of the Government during the last year and a-half, and I will venture to quote some of these declarations. In 1885 the noble Marquess, in his Ministerial Statement, said he would avoid any reference to Ireland, and would trust to the noble Earl, who was then the Viceroy, to explain the policy of the Government. The noble Earl whom I see opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) obeyed that mandate, and, following a very illustrious example, said there were three courses open to the Government. One was to re-enact the whole of the Crimes Act; the other to re-enact a portion of it; and the third was to let it lapse. But he objected to the first two courses, because he objected to exceptional legislation; and because, as he remarked, exceptional legislation had been almost continuously applied to Ireland. The statement which he thus made was of a negative character, still the tone of it was such as to please Mr. Parnell and his supporters. It led to communications between those Gentlemen and the Viceroy, in the course of which that conversation which has become famous occurred, and it led to some effectual results in the ensuing Elections. I will not quote from the speeches delivered during the autumn by some leading Members of the Government. On the eve of the meeting of Parliament the Viceroy resigned. We are told that he was in perfect accord with the Government, and that his resignation was only a preconcerted arrangement six months old. The Chief Secretary in the other House also resigned; and it is a matter of some observation that neither of those two public men have joined the present Government. The Queen's Speech, you will remember, my Lords, contained a very vague declaration as to what the policy of the Government was to be. Mr. Smith was appointed Chief Secretary, and was sent to Dublin to report. We were warned by the noble Marquess that that would take a long time; but Mr. Smith was better than his word; and we all know what happened and what were the results. A new Government came into Office, and Mr. Gladstone introduced two measures within a very few weeks of the formation of his Government. They led to a very warm and able discussion on which I need not dwell, and speeches were made both in Parliament and out of Parliament on the subject during the recent Elections, with respect to the intentions of the Government. I do not wish to argue now on the merits or demerits of these measures; but I think I can safely say that they constituted a policy at once wise and expedient, and that I believe the postponement of them was a great national misfortune. But I think we can safely assert that, whether the policy was good or bad, it was a very clear and very well-defined policy, and one which anyone who had chosen could understand. During the Elections various speeches were made, and among them the noble Marquess made a declaration which attracted great attention, which was to the effect that, in his opinion, if there were 20 years during which Parliament enabled the Government to govern Ireland resolutely, then, at the end of those 20 years, it would be possible to repeal that exceptional legislation, and give some sort of self-government to Ireland. That declaration appeared to me to be a very clear one; but on three subsequent occasions the noble Marquess had completely denied the meaning which some of us had thought seemed necessarily to flow from his words, and said that he had been misunderstood. The noble Marquess had an opportunity of making another declaration only last week, and he declared that the policy of Her Majesty's Government was to maintain social order in Ireland. But the question naturally arose, "how" and "when"? As to the question of "how," the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Henry Matthews) has enlightened his constituents. He said the policy of the Government was to defy Mr. Parnell. Now, I admit that it may be easy, and that it is a legitimate policy, to defy Mr. Parnell when he is wrong; but when it comes to defying the great majority of Members who represent the great majority of the Irish people, that is hardly a sufficient basis for a permanent policy of government in regard to Ireland. I am perfectly certain, for instance, that such a policy would not meet the case of Belfast at the present moment. I must say I regret that the noble and gallant Lord who seconded the Address (Lord de Ros), with his knowledge of Ireland, should have taken the opportunity to condemn at once the action of the police—the Queen's police—at Belfast.

LORD DE ROS: The observation that I made with regard to the Constabulary in Ireland was that it was a case that required investigation. I am not quite sure that I did not use the words "criticism" and "investigation."

EARL GRANVILLE: The noble Lord said more than that. He spoke of the conduct of the police who came from the country districts. I have now mentioned some facts as an explanation of my ignorance as to the policy of the Government, and I am sure the ignorance of hundreds of thousands, both in this country and Ireland, and it surely cannot be desirable that we should wait six months before receiving some explanation of the Irish policy of the Government. The noble Marquess may complain that we are asking for premature information; but I repeat that I do not ask for any statement of a detailed character, but only a statement of a clear and general character as to the views of Her Majesty's Government. I dare say the noble Marquess may find a precedent for a Minister asking for six months in order to elaborate his policy with regard to Ireland; but I am perfectly sure that he will not find a precedent where those measures are not merely measures of ordinary legislation, but those deeply affecting social order in Ireland. Are the Government to remain absolutely without any action and perfectly silent during this period of six months, in the same way as they did a year ago, which led to deplorable results to Ireland? The noble Marquess may complain of my questions being premature; but what was the language of the noble Marquess and his Colleagues last year? When the Government was formed, Mr. Gladstone promised, in six weeks, not to make a statement merely, but to bring in a perfected Bill on the subject. The noble Marquess received this announcement with perfect indignation, and said it was treating Parliament with levity, and that it was not only treating Parliament badly, but playing with a question of life and death to Ireland—that of social order. A little later in the year, when we had produced plans which we had hoped, if carried, would have dealt successfully with the question of social order, and when a Bill—the Arms Bill—was introduced of a precautionary character, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland got up and said a certain noble Lord was perfectly justified in insisting on the Government giving more information. What did the present Lord President of the Council (Viscount Cranbrook) do? He said—"The question is one of the moment—you are neglecting the moment." I should like to ask the noble Viscount whether there is anything of the moment at the present time? Reference has been made to the strained relations between landlords and tenants in Ireland. If there is anything more distasteful than another to us, who supported the policy of the late Government, it is anything in the nature of agrarian outrage, "Boycotting," or the wilful non-payment of rent. Anything that we can do to discourage such acts we shall do to the utmost; but I do not think the noble Marquess can say that the relations between landlord and tenant are not strained at this time. Is it safe to assume that, contrary to the experience of the last year, you are safe in taking six months—not six weeks—to consider your policy, with the view of meeting questions involving the maintenance of social order? I do venture to hope that that is hardly the view taken by the noble Marquess, and I earnestly appeal to him to make some clear declaration in answer to the question I have put to him, and not to allow it to be said that he is treating Parliament with levity, and the Sister Kingdom with fatal injustice, with regard to the vital question of social order in Ireland.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My noble Friend who has just sat down (Earl Granville) has said, in his gentlest and softest tones, quite enough to break through the languor of the season; and the quiet prudence with which his speech has been commended to the House has indicated the tone which, from the point of view of the late Government, this question is to be presented to the House. I do not regret that my noble Friend has alluded to past transactions, and has made a demand upon the present Prime Minister which I maintain the last Prime Minister is of all people in the world the least entitled to make. I should not have risen at present to interfere in this debate after the change of Government if I did not feel, as we all must feel, that we are not at the end, but at the beginning of a great political crisis. So far as my own opinions and action are concerned, and those of other noble Lords, especially my noble and learned Friend near me (the Earl of Selborne), I have done what I could, both by pen and tongue, to oppose the Irish measures of the late Government in company with many others of much greater authority and ability, and of greater persuasive powers than I possess; and I desire to avow in this House the delight with which I saw their measures defeated, and the change of Government which has taken place. Having these feelings, I think I am bound to explain them in this House. I desire shortly to recall the attention of the House to the past transactions with regard to Ireland which have brought us into the position in which we are now placed. The executive duties of a Government are always its first and paramount duty. Let us see how the late Government treated this part of its functions—the part of its functions which bears on the liberty of the Queen's subjects. I do not ask the House to go very far. Fifteen months is enough for the purpose I have in view. Let me recall the attention of the House and the country to the position in which we were then placed with regard to the protection of the Queen's subjects in Ireland. That position was a very remarkable one. In May of last year, 15 months ago, the Crimes Prevention Act was about to expire. There was much speculation as to the course Mr. Gladstone's Government would pursue. It was believed at the time, and I believe now, that there was a great difference of opinion in the Cabinet, and that the Members of that Government had great difficulty in making up their minds as to what they were to do. The expiring of the Crimes Prevention Act at that time was entirely the fault of Mr. Gladstone's own Government. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for India of the last Government (the Earl of Kimberley) told us fairly just before the Dissolution that there was not public spirit enough in political Parties to render it safe to deal with this question as it ought to be dealt with. No doubt, that was the difficulty of the Government of which my noble Friend was a Member. The Government of Mr. Gladstone had an opportunity of dealing with this question as it ought to have dealt with it, and how did it utilize the opportunity? The Crimes Act could either have been completely renewed, or could have been renewed in a partial manner. They knew that, on the expiration of that Act, difficulties would arise in the British Parliament with regard to the government of Ireland. Yet they deliberately passed it for three years, knowing that the termination of that period would be close upon the Dissolution of Parliament. Was that an act of public spirit, of patriotism, or of duty towards Ireland? Was it a fulfilment of executive obligations to protect the Queen's subjects? Although I had left the Cabinet some little time, I felt so strongly on the subject that I ventured to volunteer a remonstrance to a distinguished Member of the Government on the shortness of the period for which the Bill was passed; and I received what I thought was an unsatisfactory reply. It may be said that there were provisions in it which were stronger than was necessary. The Act had been passed under a strong feeling of indignation—almost amounting to a panic—arising out of the dreadful murders comprising the Phœnix Park tragedy, and, no doubt, it did contain some provisions of so strong and drastic a character that no Government could put them in force. It may be said that there were some clauses too strong to be enacted for a longer period than three years; but, on the other hand, however, it contained provisions which could have been put in force, and with very useful results, as to which politicians agreed, when not speaking against each other, were of permanent value. Why were not they made permanent or passed for a longer time? Owing to the miserable Party temptations which have been deprecated, Mr. Gladstone's Government deliberately provided that the whole of this legislation should fall to the ground at a date when they knew that Parliament was to be dissolved, and when they knew from past experience it would be difficult for such legislation to be renewed.

EARL GRANVILLE: No, no!

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Does my noble Friend dispute that?

EARL GRANVILLE: I dispute both motive and facts.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Ah! You dispute the motive; then I will go upon public facts. This Act of Parliament was passed for three years; and can my noble Friend deny that everybody knew that those three years would terminate close to the end of the last Parliament? Was it a piece of sound public policy, was it an act of patriotism, to pass that Act for so short a period? Was that the way in which to perform a duty of so much importance? I think not, but there was something more. There were rumours in London that the Government was rapidly breaking up on this question; whether they were true or not I cannot say; but on the 15th of May what happened? Why, Mr. Gladstone came down to the House of Commons, and announced that the Government had determined to allow certain of the most severe parts of the Act to drop and to renew certain other parts, upon which he deliberately passed this eulogium—he said that he thought they might be applied to all sections of the community, and that they were valuable and equitable. It is well known to what clauses he referred; they were the procedure clauses, which were equitable and valuable for the protection of property. So they had this deliberate information given to them by the Government—that, in their opinion, there were certain provisions of the Act which they regarded as equitable, and thought might be employed with advantage for the protection of life and property in Ireland. But what happened next? Between the 15th of May and the fall of the Government there were repeated allusions both in and out of Parliament to the determination of the Government to renew certain portions of the Crimes Act; and on several of these occasions the Head of the Government vehemently protested that the clauses which the Government had determined to renew were not coercive. He denied on two or three occasions that the word coercion could be properly applied to them. On the 8th of June there happened the catastrophe on which the Government were defeated on another subject; and on the 7th of July, after the new Government had been formed, it was announced that the Government had determined not to renew any part of the Act. Mr. Gladstone made a speech in which he renewed his language about the clauses being valuable and equitable, and he actually described the clauses he had intended to renew as being of a remedial character. He went on to point out the distinction which he contended there was between the clauses that might be described as coercive, and those which were to be regarded as remedial clauses. The distinction which he drew was this—that there were certain clauses which acted in restraint of public liberty, and those he called coercive, and certain clauses which he contended would be valuable for the protection of life and property, and these he called the remedial clauses. Now, I accept that definition, and I ask why did not the Government, when they made that distinction, make the remedial clauses of a more permanent character and pass them for such a length of time as would have allowed Ireland and this country to have had a period of rest? If the clauses were remedial, why do the Leaders of the Liberal Party and Mr. Parnell denounce the operation of the measure as coercive? But apart from that, I think your Lordships will agree that when the noble Marquess came into power he would have been justified in proposing to renew the portions of the Act which his Predecessors had intended to renew. But if the Queen's Speech had recommended the recasting of the clauses which the Leaders of the Liberal Party had pronounced to be remedial and valuable what should we have seen? We know that the mere rumour of such an intention would have been received with a universal howl of "Coercion, coercion," from all the followers of Mr. Parnell. As you are aware, the noble Marquess came to the conclusion that any attempt to renew the Act, either in whole or in part, would have failed, and I think he had some good reasons for coming to that decision. This is another case of the pure effect of faction. If the clauses were remedial in May, 1885, they must be so now; if there is any value in the definition of these clauses which was given in May, 1885, it is as valuable now as it was then, unless they can say, as perhaps they will say, that they have some other means of enforcing the law —namely, that of giving it into the hands of the law-breakers. The noble Marquess has been much blamed—at the time he was twitted and jeered at—for not renewing the Crimes Act. In my opinion the noble Marquess would have done better if he had said—"Here are clauses which you have declared to be remedial and not to be coercive; we will pass them." If the noble Marquess had done that, he would have put the Leaders of the Liberal Party in a hole, out of which it would have been difficult for them to escape. There are many men of the Liberal Party who will vote black or white with Mr. Gladstone. I do not believe the Government could have done it, considering the obstruction they would have received from the Irish Members and the number of defections in the Liberal Party itself. My opinion is, the noble Marquess would have failed in carrying it. Therefore, I view with considerable lenity the decision of the noble Marquess to govern Ireland without any exceptional powers. But then I think a good deal of the language held at that time by Members of the Conservative Party was not very discreet, and not very sincere. They hoped they might scramble through the winter, and through the short period, perhaps, of their own existence; but I cannot believe that any part of the Conservative Party thought that Ireland would be governed under the sway of Mr. Parnell without taking an additional means of enforcing the existing law. But the truth is that a Government in the position of that of the noble Marquess at

that time could hardly be said to be a Government at all. It is a great law of nature that all creatures that cannot live by strength are obliged to live by cunning; and the noble Marquess was obliged to live by cunning. He was in this position—that he was the Head of a Government in a minority in Parliament, and unable to withstand the hostile attacks of the Parties opposite, and he could hardly be said to be able to call his mind his own. I must say I believe the experiment has been, in my opinion, a disastrous one. We have had two Viceroys in succession trying this policy, and I must say that if the pick of this country had been chosen for two men from opposite sides of the House to try this policy the choice could not have been better. They were both Members of this House, men of the highest character, highly honourable men, incapable of doing anything mean towards any Party in the world; and it is impossible to read the accounts of these two Viceroys without feeling that they had been trying to govern by fear and flattery. There was a very curious incident reported the other day about Lord Aberdeen. Shortly before the change of Goverment the noble Earl in his progress came to Cork, and I saw it intimated, and it was most admirably descriptive of the whole facts of the case—"His Excellency was graciously pleased to accept a complete suit of Blarney tweed." These two Viceroys were clad from head to foot in Blarney tweed. Now, Blarney tweed may be a good thing in its way, and a part of a man's costume made of it might be of use; but to have a complete suit of it is rather too much even in Ireland, and I believe myself it has been a complete failure. I have received, within the last two or three days, a letter from a gentleman in Ireland, and whom I shall not name for the reasons which your Lordships may very well understand; but I can assure the House he is a person of very great ability. He is not one of the landlords of the country at all; but he is a native Irishman, and he is thoroughly competent to give an opinion. He gives the result of the government by Blarney. He says—

> "It will be no simple task to restore the fabric of Government in the country, the Irish Government having so hampered and defeated the law it has fallen into utter contempt."

I have received another letter from the same gentleman this morning, in which he gives some details, showing that the League which is called the National League is in close alliance with the men who commit outrages. A man who had been under police protection came and asked that it might be withdrawn; and when the Inspector asked him what had happened he replied—"My apology has been received by the Leaders of the National League, and I am safe now." There you have coercion with a vengeance. The same complaint was heard from all officials; from the Poor Law Inspectors, from the Police Inspectors, and the magistracy. It would seem to be the set purpose of the Irish Government to break up the machinery of government, in order to say that nothing was left but to hand it over to the majority. That is an account of the result of trying to govern Ireland under the present condition of things without these clauses which the Leaders of the Liberal Party themselves declared to be necessary for the safety of the country. Is it not a mockery for Members of the two Parties to bandy about the word coercion, when they have Irishmen going about in fear of their lives under the desperate coercion of an illegal society? I now pass on. I wish to refer to the new departure—the General Election of 1885. I must say that I have always been one of those who think it is the perfect right of a Member of Parliament, and still more the perfect right of a Minister of the Crown in the place of Mr. Gladstone, to change his mind on any subject whatever; but then he ought to avow it is a change of opinion, and explain the grounds on which the change was made. I remember as a young man listening to the speeches of Sir Robert Peel in the Government of Lord Melbourne, and my impression, which afterwards turned out to be true, was that Sir Robert Peel was then shaking on the subject of Protection, for he said —"We must open the ports, and when open I shall never propose to shut them again." That was how his change came about. It was perfectly open; but look at the way in which the Leaders of the Liberal Party—the Parnellite section of the Liberal Party—changed their minds at the last Election. Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, said the other day, for 15 years Mr. Bright knew very well he never opposed Home Rule in principle. I happened to be a Member of the Cabinet during that time. That 15 years takes us back to 1871, and on looking back on the speeches which Mr. Gladstone made during that period I find one delivered on the 27th of September, 1871. It is a long speech, and I am not going to trouble the House with it at any length. It is almost a violent speech against Home Rule. He distinguished in that speech between repeal of the Union and setting up a separate Parliament, Mr. Butt's proposal. He admitted that Mr. Butt's proposal was not repeal of the Union, but a separate Parliament for Ireland; and then he used these words with regard to it—

> "Can any sensible man, can any rational man, suppose that at this time of day, in this condition of this world, we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind in crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits through legislation upon the inhabitants of Ireland?"

Could a stronger passage than that be given? Why, he not only opposed Home Rule on principle, but ridiculed it. I must say that those who have been Members of his Party have a right to have explained the circumstances under which this change has taken place. It is quite true that the form his argument took in subsequent years was this—"I do not know what you mean by Home Rule; define it." But when we come to close quarters we find Home Rule denounced as disintegration of the Empire. Mr. Gladstone and his Colleagues, after the General Election in last year, not only turned completely round to Home Rule, but he also ridiculed certain of his Colleagues for maintaining the opinions from which he had himself broken. This raised a feeling of exasperation among the Members of the Liberal Party, and it ended in the breaking up and disintegration of that Party. Now, my Lords, I want to ask my noble Friend, who has been so free to ask the noble Marquess opposite for a policy, what was the policy embodied and shadowed forth in the two Bills of the late Government? Let us stand back as an artist viewing a picture, and look at the general outlines of them; and, in the first place, I must say that for any Government to take it in hand to draw up a new British Constitution in the course of six weeks or two months was an act of the profoundest audacity. The British Constitution is not a written Constitution. It has not been made that way. It is not a Constitution that has risen suddenly; it has been made by gradual accretions from time to time; and I know no man in this country who by previous study or constructive mind and power is in a position to draw up a British Constitution, or to recast the existing one, and if anyone were to attempt it I should prophesy failure at the commencement. I ventured to prophesy the failure of these Bills at the beginning on that ground, and on that grouud alone, and the result has been the ridiculous fiasco which we have witnessed, from which the Members of the right hon. Gentleman's Government retired in disgust. Those noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen posed as the friends of Ireland; but what was the nature of their scheme? First of all, and that was the root of the whole business, the expulsion of the Irish Members from Westminster—that was the forefront of the Bill; it was to get rid of the Irish Members. It was in that light the whole scheme was conceived; it was the triumph of Obstruction—the triumph of the flag which Mr. Parnell had run up and nailed to the masthead. The second object of the Bill, consequent upon the expulsion of the Irish Members from Westminster, was the exclusion of Ireland from all Imperial concerns. Is that a boon for Ireland? I know many Irishmen who do not think it, and who are furious with indignation. I can tell the House this —that soon after these Bills were announced I was brought into personal contact with many Irishmen in this country—distinguished men who did not mix with politics—and I never saw men so indignant and so disgusted—and justly indignant as I think—that they and their countrymen should be expelled from all concern in the Imperial Government. The third object of this Bill was the establishment of a separate Parliament in Dublin, with power to plunder the minority; and the fourth was to open a door of escape to certain classes in Ireland who refused these terms. What came of the scheme when we came to discuss it? In what I have said of the late Government I must make one, or rather two, exceptions—that of Mr. John Morley, whose speeches have been eminently honest and straightforward, and my noble Friend the late Lord President of the Council (Earl Spencer), who stuck to his principles, but with some dexterity avoiding some points of it. What happened with the other Members of the Government? My right hon. Friend once said that the resources of civilization were not exhausted. Is such a scheme as that to which I have referred a resource of civilization—to reduce Ireland to the position of a tributary Province, paying a fixed tribute and having nothing to do with Imperial concerns? Is that a resource of civilization, and is there any Government in Europe, or the world, that has ever resorted to such an expedient in regard to an integral part of their own Dominions? There is none. It is a resource of barbarism, and not civilization. If you tell me that is the right of the majority of the Representatives of Ireland, I say there is no man, not even Mr. Parnell, nor three-fifths of the Irish people who support him, who have the right to barter away the liberty of the other two-fifths for their own temporal benefit. Those Bills were a corrupt bargain for your own temporary convenience, made in order to avoid the difficulties of the problem of the government of Ireland. Mr. Parnell asked—"What are you afraid of? Surely Ireland is a small nation, and you cannot be afraid of her. You have your Army, and your Navy, and all the military resources of the country at your command; why, then, should you not allow us to do as we like?" My Lords, I answer that question by saying that we are afraid of nothing except dishonour; and we think it would be dishonourable to give up the minority of the Irish people to the uncontrolled power of the majority without laying down any fundamental principles for the protection of life, property, and honour. It is a bargain we have no right to make. Now, I cannot pass on, even for a moment, without referring to the strange attack made in the stress which has been laid by the Head of the late Government on the Union; and what I wish to point out is this—that the question of the morality of the Union of 1800 cannot be affected by the addition of 40 or 45 Members to the Parnellite Party in the House of Commons. Men who have been 50 years in Parliament, without saying a word upon this subject before, now jump up and say, "Was anything so immoral, so atrocious?"—I will not use the words that were used by the late Leader of the Liberal Party—but morality does not depend on Party exigencies, and I deny and repudiate the whole argument. In the first place, even if it were true, nothing would be more childish than to condemn the Union because it was corruptly obtained. How was the reformation of the English Church effected? Look at the conduct of Henry VIII. and his proceedings. Will Mr. Gladstone allow that the atrocities of Henry VIII. are a reason for pulling down the whole thing? But I deny the immorality of the proceeding. The Irish Parliament was a small and a very corrupt one. Mr. Gladstone himself has told us there were 120 or 130 placemen—a great many pensioners and holders of small boroughs—and I say it was impossible to get the Government out of their hands and destroy corruption, except by paying the price that existing law enabled them to demand. It was like ransoming the nation from the hands of bandits. The money paid was a ransom rather than a bribe, and it was to raise the Irish people to an equality with ourselves. Let me tell the Leaders of the Liberal Party that there is no man, and there is no Party in this country, who can with impunity revile the character of Mr. Pitt and his Party. Look at his speeches in 1800, and compare them with the shrieking speeches we have heard at this day. Look at the magnanimity of his tone towards Ireland, and the manifest desire he had to raise Ireland, to make her perfectly equal with England in a united Parliament, and to induce her to take an equal part in the management of Imperial affairs. As public opinion is now being instructed by such speeches as those of Mr. Gladstone, I take exception to the whole argument, and I maintain that the conduct of Mr. Pitt was pure and elevated conduct with a pure and elevated purpose. Well, my Lords, what happened to these two Bills when they came to be discussed before the constituencies? At the suggestion of the expulsion of the Irish Members from Westminster there was an immediate outcry by the Radical Party—"You are going to separate taxation and representation." The result was that the Government ran away before their own Bills. For instance, there was the expulsion of the Irish Members from the House of Commons. The people of this country are not particularly fond of the Irish Members as now represented in the House of Commons; but they had a political instinct that if these men were turned out they would have a separate Parliament for Ireland. What were the views of the Members of the late Government as to that matter? They were all different. Some of them said—"We will give up the expulsion;" and I think that even Mr. Gladstone consented to deal with the subject. Now, what was the next part of the scheme? It was the separation of Irish from Imperial concerns. I wish my noble Friends on the Front Opposition Bench to remember this—that the separation of Irish from Imperial concerns stands at the very root of the whole scheme. If you cannot make that separation, you cannot carry out your scheme. Well, what did Mr. Gladstone say in his opening speech, which has now been published as a pamphlet? He said that "it passed the wit of man to devise a separation between purely Irish and Imperial concerns." Well, then we have the Purchase Scheme. I must say that my noble Friend the Lord President of the Council is one of those who stuck to his guns about the Purchase Scheme, not, I think, with a perfect and complete resolution, because he talked about the number of years' purchase as a matter of detail. But Mr. John Morley throughout said—"I never will be a party to any Bill which does not secure the land interest in Ireland against confiscation." The other Members of the late Government did not say the same. I can compare their conduct to nothing but two familiar words—"cut" and "shuffle." Some of them cut the scheme altogether; others shuffled. Mr. Childers, at Edinburgh I think, said he would have nothing more to do with any Purchase Scheme. If the Members of the then Government differed so much during the Election, what right have they now to come to the Conservative Party and say, "Give us a policy"? Why, they had no policy to be called a policy to present to Parliament, not having made up their minds on the points to which I have referred. Just before the Dissolution I ventured to ask what was meant by purely Irish affairs—was it a purely Irish affair that

Ireland should be allowed to conduct her business in peace? My noble Friend had not a word to say in reply. A separate Irish Parliament is no policy at all, unless you tell us what an Irish Parliament is to do. I maintain, therefore, that the late Government have no right whatever to ask their Successors for a policy, when they have produced two Bills from every part of which they have retreated in disastrous flight. May I now address a few words to the Benches opposite, and to the noble Marquess at the head of the new Government? I hope he will not be induced by such feeble questioners to announce some brand-new land policy for Ireland; that he will not fall into the trap into which Mr. Gladstone fell, of trying, with his unassisted resources, to frame a new Constitution for the British Empire. It is a task not to be accomplished even by my noble Friend opposite; if he attempts it he will assuredly fail. The noble Lords who are so fond of their own policy, but who cannot decide what it was, would run into it in one place, and the Parnellites in another; and possibly the noble Marquess would not be able to carry his disciplined forces with him in a policy so far-reaching and gigantic. But there are some preliminaries which I wish earnestly to urge on the attention, not only of the Members of the Conservative Party, but of the public of this country. The first thing is to clear our minds of the wretched cant that has been talked about the misgovernment of Ireland. It is all very well to say that we have not been wise in our treatment of Ireland, and that we repent of our errors. That is quite fair; but to say that we have done nothing but injure Ireland for centuries, and to say that all the evils of Ireland have resulted from our treatment of her, that is pure cant. Decidedly, it is not historically true. Let me take one or two of the greatest wrongs of Ireland. Take the Penal Laws. They were very bad and horrible, and much to be deprecated; but I believe Mr. Froude to be right when he says that the Penal Laws in Ireland were merely a rebound of the Penal Laws against the Protestants in France. They were a rebound of the echo of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; they were part of a system under which Europe then groaned. It was a period of universal persecution, and unquestionably the Protestants of Ireland would have been subjected to the same penalties if the Catholics had had the same opportunity. Bad, therefore, as those laws were, let us condemn them in the light of history, and not pretend that it was the peculiar fault of the British Government. Take, again, the restraints on trade. I declare that more harm was done to Ireland by our commercial legislation than by all the landlords and Land Laws in that country; but here, again, it was a period of universal Protection. Do we not know that our own municipalities were founded on Protection? Every Scotch burgh was steeped up to the ears in Protection. It was an era of Protection, and England is not to be blamed in that sense for having pursued the general and, as I believe, the wretched policy of that day. Well, then, with regard to the land system. Now, on this point I wish to say a word, because I see that Mr. John Morley said that we have given to Ireland a land system the most wretched in the world. There never was a more gross historical misrepresentation. The Land Laws of Ireland, in so far as they are the same with our laws—as they are to a great extent—are the same Land Laws which prevail all over civilized Europe. What is peculiar and miserable in the Irish Land Law is a direct descent and derogation of the old Celtic customs, purely Irish in its origin. Look at the account which Sir John Davis gives of this subject; look at the miseries which existed beyond the Pale in the old Irish Celtic customs; look at the statement which he makes of the desire on the part of the unfortunate Irish to be brought within the Pale that they might enjoy the protection of the English landlords. They are poisoning the ears of the Irish people who do not know that the worst customs of the Irish land system, and which have led more than anything else to the misery of the country and the poverty and superstition that exist, are directly descended from their own Celtic Chiefs. Then take a modern case, and look at the last Land Act, which you passed yourselves. What did my noble Friend the late President of the Council say? At Lancaster, during the Election Campaign, he said that the last Irish Land Act was a right and salutary Act; but the Irish themselves would not allow it to be worked.

It came to this, then—that the Irish people are not allowed to have the benefit of the Land Act, because the National League are determined that it should not be put in operation. They will not accept land legislation from a British Parliament. In the letter which I have read from a friend he mentions a curious fact. One of the prominent parts of Mr. Gladstone's Land Act was that of the free right of sale of the tenants. But the National League have denounced the farmers who sold their tenant right, and I am credibly informed that a great many farmers are not allowed to sell their tenant right on account of the new rule of the National League. Here we have the miseries and distress in Ireland all arising from the Irish themselves thwarting in every conceivable way the boon which the British Parliament is desirous of giving them. Take the Cottage Act, which passed your Lordships' House a few years ago. It was grumbled at and objected to by some noble Lords. They thought it a dangerous Bill; but we have some Irish Legal Peers, and they told us that it was all right, and would do no harm. I am told now that the amount of gross jobbery being perpetrated under that Act is considerable; and, as we know from other sources of information, the labourers of Ireland are getting no benefit whatever from your measures. On the contrary, they are worse off than ever. My friend says that the measures of Mr. Gladstone are like the story of the veterinary surgeon who sent in a bill with this heading—"For curing the mare until it died." Mr. Gladstone is very fond of referring to Edmund Burke. Here is a passage from Edmund Burke, in which he uses this expression in a letter—"I must speak the truth; I must say that all the evils of Ireland originated within itself." I venture to propound in this House now that the miseries of Ireland are not mainly due to misrule, but to the mischievous customs of the people themselves. I wish to say a word before I sit down as to the demand made on the present Government for a policy. The late Government have no right to make that demand; but, at the same time, I am not prepared to deny that there are things to be done for Ireland. I have long had an opinion—and I am rather ashamed that I have not publicly expressed it; but I express it now with the fullest conviction of its truth—that in our dealings with the Roman Catholic population of Ireland we have not been fair, or even reasonable. It is part of the ultra-Liberal creed—of Liberalism as distinguished from liberality—that religion should be separated from education. That is a doctrine which is resolutely resisted by the Roman Catholic priesthood. We have insisted upon enforcing secular education. I maintain that we should go as far, at least, as they do in Canada, and allow purely denominational education, avowed to be such, as such, in every part of Ireland in proportion to the population. That is the rule in Canada, where there is a large mixed population. I believe our national system has been getting more and more denominational in fact; but still, in principle, the present system is opposed to the feelings and sentiments of the Irish Roman Catholics, and for those feelings, however much I may differ from their Church, I have the strongest sympathy and respect, and with which, as I differ from the Roman Catholic Church, I do not feel entitled to interfere. We have been told by Mr. Gladstone that for the last 15 years he has never resisted Home Rule on principle. That is a declaration as to the perfect sincerity of which I have no doubt; but certainly he has contrived to conceal his opinion from those about him. Some may have suspected it; others may have had a doubt; but there is no public utterance which would lead to that conviction. But I imagine that the people of Ireland have felt that they were dealing with a mind that was uninformed upon these subjects—with a mind that was not firm, just as a vicious horse feels the hand of a weak rider. And the result has been what might be expected. When Irish tenants have been urged to buy their farms under the favourable terms offered them by the late Government, their reply has been—"No; why put ourselves in that position just now, when we know that the Liberal Government will concede anything to successful agitation? Let us bide our time, and we will get land, if not for nothing, at least at a nominal price." My own conviction is that that is the feeling at the root of the difficulties with which we have to deal. There is a sense of weakness and insecurity and uncer-

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV

tainty as to the very fundamental doctrines of human society. Everything is giving way under the feet of those who long for some firm foundation on which to stand. In the most remarkable Address that was ever delivered—the farewell Address of Washington—he said—

> "All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive to this fundamental principle, obedience to the law, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a Party, often a small but artful and enterprizing minority of the community."

I commend these words to the growing Democracies. I am myself for a Democracy, provided it be an honest and a virtuous Democracy.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I am desirous of saying a few words with reference to that part of the speech of the noble Earl opposite which, in some degree, referred to myself. He recapitulated some of my words and deeds during the late Administration of my noble Friend the present Prime Minister. I do not feel that I can take exception to his inferences from those words and deeds, because it was difficult to know what inferences he drew; but if there was an innuendo, it was one conveying that I was unable to continue as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland owing to my being unable to agree with my Colleagues. If that was what he intended to convey, I can only tell him that he is entirely deceived. Reference has also been made to the government of Ireland during my Viceroyalty; but when my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) said that the whole course of my Administration in Ireland was to govern by flattery and blarney, he went far beyond the facts of the case. I can only say that the materials at my command were scanty; but such as they were they were fully utilized. The materials were insufficient, but the law was enforced with remarkable success. Convictions were obtained at the Winter Assizes, and there was not a single miscarriage of justice. I quite agree as to the importance of the maintenance of the law; but there is another question besides that of the maintenance of the law, and that is the sufficiency of the law. There were certain parts of that Crimes Act the value of which I never concealed, and the absence of which would have rendered government in Ireland very difficult. I have tried the full force of the existing law in Ireland, and I do not hesitate to say that that law was insufficient for the purpose; but, having said that, I wish to add that I adhere to my opinion that the remedy for that state of things is not the enactment of exceptional and temporary legislation. I believe that exceptional and temporary legislation really weakens the hands of the Government, inspires a sense of disquiet, and is calculated in the long run to weaken rather than to strengthen the authority of the law. In 1844 or 1845, when the state of Ireland was as bad as it could be, Sir Robert Peel deprecated appealing to Parliament for exceptional legislation. The remedy lies in strengthening the law, but in making that law at the same time general and permanent, and such as would apply to all parts of the United Kingdom. During the last two or three months many people have attributed to me very different opinions from those which I hold. I desire at once to express my satisfaction, at the opening of a new Parliament, that upon this great question—after long controversy—the decision of the country has been clear and undeniable. It would have been a great misfortune if the country had seemed to be halting between two opinions. I understand the opinion of the country, as expressed in the present Parliament, to be this—there is to be a complete supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in Irish matters; in other words, whatever liberties are granted, whatever concessions are made, the control of the Imperial Parliament is to be clear, real, and effective. The Bill of Mr. Gladstone did not secure this. It created an Irish Parliament and an Irish Executive responsible to the Irish Parliament. It did not leave the effective control in the Crown, because the Crown would be advised by the Irish Ministers, and not by the Imperial Ministers. This was the broad issue that was before the country, and I hope all reasonable men will accept its verdict. I believe that within the limits of the popular decision there is enough to be done, not only to provide for the due administration, enforcement, and maintenance of the law, but also to give a reasonable amount of contentment to the Irish people. One of the great faults of Mr. Gladstone's scheme was that it must have failed in the nature of things to bring contentment to Ireland. It stimulated, but it could not satisfy, hopes and aspirations. But the most grievous part of the recent proceedings is that, by his failure, Mr. Gladstone has, by raising these aspirations, by creating these false hopes, deferred to a more distant day anything like a real settlement of the Irish Question. Over and above that it overlooked the A B C of the question—the existence of discordant races and creeds in that country. The Belfast riots proved the miscalculation that was made on this point. No real provision was made to meet it. The fact remains that you have to deal with two distinct nations; and any settlement made in ignorance of that fact will be a settlement in name and not in reality. I cordially echo the hope that the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) will not express any opinion on this subject at present, but will preserve at present that reticence which characterizes the Speech from the Throne already hinted at. It is a problem both great and grave which is before the Government. I will not say that I think it an insoluble problem; that would be to give up all statesmanship. But it needs every advantage, and not the least that of time for its consideration, to produce anything which shall give peace and contentment to Ireland, and which shall prevent its being in the future, as it has been in the past, the sport of Party and the mere football of factions. Some of the principal evils may be summed up in this formula—too much has been extorted, or has seemed to be extorted, from the English Government by fear; each concession has been used too much as a lever to obtain more. From first to last, through successive Governments, there has been a failure of that continuity of policy which alone can give rest and peace. I would urge my noble Friend to consider how far some change may not be made in Private Bill legislation. Nothing can be less satisfactory than that Gas and Water Bills, which concern the purely domestic life of Ireland, should be dealt with here, at Westminster. Then I hope the noble Marquess will turn his attention to the burning question of education, and especially higher, technical, and industrial education. There is no light in Ireland burning so brightly as that of industrial education. It has done more good, probably, than anything else; and the work is capable of almost indefinite expansion, with results which can only contribute to the public safety. Some parts of Ireland are in the position of an undeveloped Colony. There can be no prosperity in the absence of good roads to enable the people to bring their produce to the markets. Then I hope the noble Marquess will consider the reconstruction of certain parts of the Executive Government, and in particular the powers of the Lord Lieutenant. That important functionary possesses powers just enough to expose him to misunderstanding and misrepresentation, but not sufficient to enable him to render any real service. There can be no doubt that in certain parts of Ireland the Land Question is at the root of the difficulty. There are certain parts of Ireland in which the poverty is so great—the condition of the people is such that, until this is remedied, all chance of attaining prosperity is simply delusive. Time after time this has been stated by statesmen, travellers, and writers; but still there is the same story to tell that was true 100 years ago. There are many distinguished Viceroys who have been brought face to face with this grinding pauperism. Why have they all failed? Many reasons might be given; but perhaps this reason would be found deep down in the question—there has been a serious want of accord in the English and Irish nations. The Irish heart was not attuned to concord, and until that sympathy is in some degree restored there cannot be a real and satisfactory settlement of the Irish Question. I have heard a great deal lately as to the value of giving identical institutions to England and Ireland. It is a very large question; but I must say it is true only up to a certain point. Ireland does not want exactly the same institutions locally as England, and could not endure them if she had. The condition of things are different in the two countries; and an identity of local institutions in Ireland, if forced upon her, may not only be useless, but will, in my opinion, be made very harmful. The greatest possible caution ought to be observed by those who press forward that view. I will only add that there are two sides to this question. On the one hand, there is the promotion of education, material interests, and the development of the country, which would call out all the local energies, and which would, to a certain extent, satisfy local aspirations; and, on the other hand, there is the maintenance and enforcing of the law, the supremacy of the Crown, the authority of Parliament; and, lastly, the maintenance of the sanctity of private rights. It may be difficult to reconcile these different and apparently conflicting interests. But I cannot agree that it is impossible. There are many plans. I hope the Government will carefully consider all these. I hope they will take time to do this. They have my best wishes. For several years there has been a time of public disgust. Confidence has been shaken, credit has been damaged, and many questions which call aloud for settlement at home and abroad in the consolidation of the Empire are waiting. I wish them energy to discharge their task, and long life in which to perform it; and when the time of their political decease arrives—as I suppose it must arrive for them as for other Governments—I can wish them nothing better than that it should be recorded of them in Scriptural language—"For many years the land had rest."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My Lords, in taking part in this debate, which has been singularly varied, I wish to point out that it has wandered further from the original subject that was submitted to your Lordships than any debate that I remember. I freely admit that perhaps it was due to the scantiness of original matter rather than to your Lordships. But I do not intend to attempt to go into all the matters that have arisen in this debate. I will rather endeavour to answer one or two of the criticisms that have been passed upon ourselves, and give such reply as I can to the benevolent questions of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville). And, in the first place, I will venture to say a word in defence of our action in asking Parliament to go on with the Business of the Session now instead of putting it off, as the noble Earl suggested we might have done, until October. There seems to us a vital objection to the latter course. The public money is granted till the 1st of November. If we had met on the 15th of October, say, and it was known that if only 15 days passed away without the passing of the Appropriation Act the Government of the country could no longer be carried on, I am afraid considerable apprehension would have taken hold of the public mind. Without imputing to any persons a desire to embarrass the Government, or to lengthen the proceedings of Parliament to any unreasonable extent, I do not think it probable, knowing that, with the best intentions, the other House of Parliament is not always able to confine its labours within reasonable limits—I do not think it at all improbable that the limit of the 1st of November could have been reached without the necessary financial provision being made for the year. We do not think it right to run such a risk as this, and we have appealed to the patriotism of Parliament to close the Session forthwith. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) has spoken of the many omissions in the Queen's Speech. Well, they say that the size of a tree depends upon the size of the root from which it springs. Possibly the magnitude of the discussion on the Queen's Speech depends on the length of the Speech to be discussed. We were anxious to limit the Speech to that matter for which Parliament has been called together, in the traditional words which are addressed to the House of Commons at the beginning of every new Parliament; and, therefore, the Queen's Speech on this occasion is confined to recommendations as to the passing of the Estimates. We could not recommend the passing of legislation, because we do not propose that any legislation should be passed in this fragment of a Session. With respect to the statement on foreign and Colonial affairs, to which reference has been made, it must be remembered that not much more than six weeks have passed since another Queen's Speech was addressed to Parliament containing the views of the Ministers of the day on all those questions. There has hardly been time enough to make any new statement with respect to public affairs that should have the merit of novelty; and if it had the merit of novelty, it might have the demerit of expressing views in a formal document different from those which Her Majesty had been previously advised to express. But I shall be very happy to answer, as far as I can, the one or two questions which the noble Earl has addressed to me on that point. The most important question was that, I think, with regard to Burmah; and with respect to Burmah I have to acknowledge that it is not in a satisfactory condition. How it reached that unsatisfactory condition I do not know. We were not in Office, or in possession of official knowledge, during the time that process took place. I think when we left Office the annexation was proceeding in a very healthy way, and there was every prospect of the speedy restoration of order and the government of Burmah in peace and prosperity. I do not wish for a moment to suggest that the noble Earl opposite is responsible for matters not turning out in a different way. I do not suggest, and I do not in the least know; but I deny that we are responsible for what took place between the beginning of February and the present time. If the process has been difficult and has gone wrong, I daresay it is from causes which are unavoidable; but, at all events, it was from causes for which we cannot be held responsible. With respect to the actual state of affairs, although they are very unsatisfactory, it would be very exaggerated language to say that there was any cause for apprehension and alarm. I think an intelligible mistake has been made in not using enough men and not spending as much money as was necessary at first; but as soon as the hot weather is over measures of a larger character will be taken, and, as far as I can judge from the opinions of those who are entitled to pronounce an opinion on the subject, the difficulties in the way of the restoration of order which exist will speedily be removed. I hope when the cold weather comes we shall have but the regret that we have not been able to restore it sooner. I do not apprehend that there is any doubt of the anticipations drawn that British rule in Burmah will result both in an extension of trade to this country, and also much greater happiness and well-being to the people of Burmah itself. I have no fear whatever but that those anticipations will be realized. With respect to the Afghan Frontier, I think there is a little misapprehension on that subject also with respect to the withdrawal of our Commission. What has taken place has not been stated with absolute accuracy. The matters at issue between us and the Russian Government, though of some considerable importance, are not very large in point of territory. The knowledge with respect to it is complete. The discussion can be carried on quite as well between London and St. Petersburg as it can in the desolate regions where the demarcation is to take place. There is also always a considerable inconvenience in leaving British officers throughout the tremendous winter of those regions far from any support, far from their own officers, and still farther from their own Government. It is impossible to say, with the best will on the part both of the Russian and Afghan Governments, what accidents might happen in a country which is, of course, only very partially governed and partially controlled; and we do not think it desirable, merely for these 20 miles of frontier that still remain in dispute, that the Commission should spend another winter in those regions. But some time will elapse, and I think there is every reason to hope that the Governments will come to an agreement on the subject. With respect to other matters of foreign affairs, the noble Earl inferred from the silence of the Speech that there was nothing in foreign affairs which deserves mention or which could cause solicitude. Perhaps that would be carrying an optimist view of the situation too far. But there is nothing to cause apprehension. Many regions of the world have been for some time past, and are still, in a state of equilibrium which cannot be described as stable. The maintenance of peace depends upon many accidents, as noble Lords opposite have experienced during the last six months of Office. They saw how many difficulties were arising from the conflict of rising nationalities and old Dominions in the South-East of Europe. I will not say, any more than in the last spring, all cause of solicitude is entirely taken away; but I do not think there is any good cause for perplexity. The policy of this country has been very clearly marked out for a considerable time, and it is our intention to adhere to the traditions that we have inherited. The integrity of the Turkish

Empire, as defined by Treaties, is of great importance in our judgment, as it has been in the judgment of many statesmen in past times—of great importance to the peace of Europe—of great importance to the interests of this country. While desiring to do all we can to insure the welfare and the progress of the populations of those regions, we still hold by the integrity of the Turkish Empire as one of the conditions on which the present European system is based. We have every hope that, in holding that view, we shall, as in times past, have the support of our Allies. We heartily approve the action initiated partly by ourselves, and carried on consistently by noble Lords opposite, which was directed towards maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire during the spring and summer of this year. That was a specimen of the difficulties which may arise, and it was an indication of the ease with which, under firm treatment, those difficulties will disappear; and though from time to time causes of alarm will seem to arise, though they will be magnified by the eagerness of rumour, and though there may be in the political sky ambiguous indications from time to time, I still maintain the firm hope and belief that by adhering steadily to the policy which has been the English policy for a great number of years, we shall contribute, and contribute effectively and with success, to the permanent maintenance of the peace of Europe. The noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll) and the noble Earl behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) have urged us not to be too speedy in announcing a policy for Ireland. That is not precisely the advice we got from the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville). I do not wish to go much into the past. A great deal of the discussion has turned on the past, no doubt most legitimately; but I think I should, perhaps, be unnecessarily wasting the time of the House if I were to follow far into the subjects that have been opened up. Among many other well-worn subjects, the question of our innocence or guilt for not renewing the Crimes Act has been brought again before your Lordships. I have nothing to add to what I have already said on that subject. May I say that I think the importance of the Crimes Act, as such, or at least some particular clauses of it, has been a great deal overrated. Whether any legislation was then or may be hereafter required in aid of the Criminal Law in Ireland is quite another matter. I am ready to admit that our policy of last year is open to discussion on that point. I am not ready, however, to admit that the success or the failure of our Irish policy depended on those particular clauses of the Crimes Act on which so much has been said. I think they were valuable, but their importance has been very much overrated. I can only say, with regard to this vexed question of our conduct in not proposing special criminal legislation in July last year, that those who judge us must remember the extraordinarily peculiar circumstances of the time. We had not a tenure of Office in the ordinary sense. We were governing during a necessary interregnum—an interregnum produced by the peculiar action of the Reform Bill and the sudden fall of the Government which passed it. The question before us was not, in my mind, whether we should pass criminal legislation or not. I am perfectly convinced that it was impossible to have passed it, but the question was whether it was so necessary for the purpose of governing Ireland that if we were not prepared to pass it we ought to have refused to take Office altogether. I admit that that is a question open to discussion. It might have been our duty to refuse Office at that time because we could not pass criminal legislation. I did not think so. Believing, at that time, that Home Rule was out of the question—both Parties were thoroughly agreed in repudiating it—I looked upon the movement in Ireland as in the nature of a transitory movement which would have its rise, its culmination, and its fall, like all moral movements of the kind, and I thought we were approaching a period in which additional criminal legislation could be dispensed with. I do not know whether any additional criminal legislation would have done any good; but of this I am certain—that it is a mistake to ridicule, as the noble Duke did, what he was pleased to call the "blarney suit of conciliation"—that is to say, the assumption of a conciliatory attitude in governing the people of Ireland. I think we were perfectly right in doing all we could by conciliation to put an end to the war against the law which unhappily prevailed. I am sure that if our efforts failed it was not due to any want of devotion or want of ability on the part of my noble Friend the then Viceroy (the Earl of Carnarvon), who did all that was possible to be done in the circumstances. I am willing to leave to the judgment of the House whether we erred or did not; but it is merely a question of history, which has no bearing on the present. The whole surface of the problem has been changed by what has taken place during the present year. I do not wish to discuss in a controversial spirit the measures proposed by the late Government; but a tremendous change in the attitude of political Parties, the abandonment of the position which had been held for so long, the proposal of measures which would have had a revolutionary effect in the strictest sense of the word, which would have put those at the head who have been under, and those under who had been at the head—measures which would have placed the whole machinery for the repression of crime in Ireland in the hands of those who hitherto, with too good reason, have been suspected of being themselves the favourers and the instigators of crime—I say, such measures as these, such a history as that which has been the history of the relations of England to Ireland during the past half-year, have changed the whole of this problem; and I, for one—and I am sure my Colleagues too—do not feel competent, until we have been able to study the question with much greater care than we have hitherto given to it, to offer that solution of the problem which the noble Earl calls upon us to give. We were returned with one mandate—to maintain the Union. We believe that we represent accurately the wishes of the people of this country when we say that it is our duty to give our efforts, above everything else, to the restoration of social order and the maintenance of legal rights. It is our duty, besides this, to study carefully every measure by which prosperity or contentment in Ireland can be secured. But when I am asked to go into details—when I hear talk of Irish Government Offices, of the educational question, of the reform of the government, of local government, which is not an Irish question, but a United Kingdom question, and which must be dealt with on lines generally similar at the same time over the whole country at once—when these matters are suggested for discussion, I can only answer that, whatever legislation we may have to propose, time, consideration, and inquiry are, above all things, necessary, so that we will give the utmost attention to all these questions, but that we are not ready now to furnish any sketch of our future legislative proposals. I have indicated the broad lines within which the policy of the Government must be kept; but into the details I could not go with any prospect of satisfaction to your Lordships. But I am bound to recognize that there are matters into which we may inquire, and there are administrative measures we may take. My noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) has spoken of the material resources of Ireland, which he justly said require the attention of the Government for the purpose of their future development. There is no subject which, I think, is more worthy of the attention of the Government than that to which my noble Friend has drawn attention. I hope that we shall give full and special inquiry to that question of developing the local resources of Ireland, following, in some respects, the steps of our Predecessors; and I hope, also, in some respects, improving on their doctrines. The development of the fisheries, the extension of arterial drainage, of local railways, and many other things of that kind, which have occupied the attention of Governments in the past, but in respect to which nothing like a full or complete or satisfactory determination has been arrived at—these things will occupy our careful attention during the Recess. With respect to social order, I think I can say that we have shown that we are not without a policy. Measures of the most summary, of the most effective kind, have been taken for the purpose of restoring order in Belfast, and they have succeeded. I cannot mention those terrible conflicts without expressing the horror which they must have excited in men's minds. I think that they are well fitted to prove to the British public the abnormal conditions of society in Ireland, and how far removed is the harmony and agreement which does so much to make our institutions work well in this country. But I would not express an opinion further in detail in regard to these proceedings, because an inquiry was set on foot by the late Government, to which we shall give expansion, and possibly we may seek special Parliamentary powers—an inquiry which will place on the firm basis of fact the controversies as to the responsibility of the various parties in connection with them, which can now be only a matter of speculation. I will only say, in passing, that I do not think there is any ground—at least, any *primâ facie* ground—except what may be shown by subsequent inquiry, for impugning the conduct of the Constabulary. As to the statement that constables have been brought from the South to the North, that is, I believe, no exceptional proceeding. I think it is usual, and it is obviously convenient, to appoint constables in those districts where they have no special connection; and I do not think there was an intention or wish to offer anything like a challenge, or to produce anything in the nature of division. I believe the police have, upon the whole, on this as on other occasions, behaved with courage, discretion, and discipline. Of any individual case of indiscipline the Commission will take cognizance; but in dealing with a body like the Royal Irish Constabulary we are bound to remember that they have borne a great part in maintaining the English Government in Ireland, and we are bound to consider all their actions with the utmost consideration, forbearance, and generosity, and not hastily to believe that they have fallen away from the merits which in former times they have so prominently displayed. There can be no doubt whatever that it was by the concentration of the military that the uproar was put down. The state of disorder was so great that it would have justified the exercise of far sterner measures than those to which we were driven; but I believe it is often the wisest and kindest thing to employ the military at once in cases of that kind; and I believe that the result obtained of the experiment in Belfast will be a guide to the Irish Government in the future. With respect to social order generally in Ireland, it is difficult to say that it is in a state unusually bad. Unfortunately, we have been accustomed to phenomena which have not in this present year been repeated in any excessive form. But there still is, undoubtedly, a considerable amount of outrage, though small as compared with that of former years, when it attracted the attention of Parliament. I will not trouble your Lordships with many figures; I will simply state one or two just to show, with respect to the law in Ireland, how matters really stand. In 1882, which was one of the worst years, the total number of outrages for the six months ending on the 31st of July was 2,310; whereas, in 1886, they were 551—so that they have fallen to about a quarter of what they were in the former year. With respect to their progress, they seemed to have increased in intensity in the beginning of the year up to June, and the month of July shows a rather better record. But the most remarkable circumstance with respect to them is that they are mainly confined to the South-West of Ireland. The counties of Kerry, Clare, and a portion of Limerick, I think, take not far from half of all outrages recorded. We have reason to doubt whether the administrative arrangements are as good as they might be for maintaining order in these counties. For instance, in the county of Kerry there are 300 more policemen than the ordinary establishment. Well, that is a considerable number for a single county, and you would imagine that it would give very considerable aid in the detection of crime; but the fact is that almost the whole of these 300 policemen are employed in the practice of what is called personal protection. That is to say, about 300 policemen—I believe the exact number is 292—are engaged in the protection of 145 persons. Of course, that is a very small contribution to the figures of a whole county, even if they were divided equally among those 145 persons; but I find that a noble Earl with whom we are all acquainted, the Earl of Kenmare, employs no less than 38 policemen for his individual protection. A lady who lives in the same county takes 32 policemen for her own protection. Now, it is, of course, very desirable that there should be protection for valuable lives; but I believe that each policeman costs, when you take all expenses, something like £100. I cannot help thinking that we might protect the Earl of Kenmare more cheaply than that, and that the £3,800 which will represent the whole cost of the 38 policemen shows some weakness in the organization. Of course, I must not be supposed to impute the smallest blame to the Earl of Kenmare; but I say that the system has drifted into an unreasonable shape, and that it is a matter which requires careful overhauling and inquiry, and probably entire reorganization. We think it is a matter that requires a fresh eye, and that order will not be restored unless we can bring to bear some new arrangement, or, at all events, that the attention of minds which have been engaged in the solution of similar problems in other parts of the globe—of men who know how to exercise discipline, and who know how to extract from a small force the greatest possible effect—that by the employment of some such men we might attain to a system more effective than that which I have indicated, and that so large a number of police may, under such guidance, really accomplish the prevention and the detection of crime in those districts. We propose to send Sir Redvers Buller to control all the local Police Force and the local organizations; and we believe—at least, we have good hope—that, even with our present powers, and without any large expenditure of force, we shall be able to bring to an end the outrages which now disgrace parts of Ireland. At the same time, we must not look upon social order in Ireland as entirely or mainly a matter of outrages. If it were merely the outrages we had to consider, Ireland would be now in a tolerably satisfactory condition, because the outrages are restricted to certain very limited districts, or, at least, the excessive number of outrages are so restricted. The evil we really have to deal with is the organized system of intimidation. I do not say that any reorganization of the police can reach that evil. It has grown larger and larger. Boycotting has extended, not so much, but still a little, since this time last year, and intimidation appears to have reached that point that it is impossible in many parts of Ireland to obtain evidence of it. I merely indicate it as the most difficult of the problems that we have to solve, and I am sure that in that sentiment I shall have the assent of two or three former Viceroys of Ireland. The precise mode in which we are to deal with it I do not venture to indicate. I merely wish to point out to the House that until we have dealt with it we have done nothing to restore the freedom of the innocent and to provide for the punishment of the guilty in Ireland. That is one of the first and most pressing duties of the Government, and we shall address ourselves to it with an earnest hope that either by the use of the powers of the law, or, if they do not suffice, by the further powers which we shall ask of Parliament, we shall be able gradually to diminish and extinguish this great evil. My noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon), I think, referred to the Land Question, to the total poverty of many of the cultivators, and to the fearful and appalling problems which that poverty presents, not only to the Government, but to all who wish well to Ireland. The Land Question is one on which we have had anxious and even angry controversies in this House. I do not wish to go back on questions that are past now; but I did not approve of the legislation of 1881, and I offered my protest against it. I was overruled, but I have ventured more than once to press on your Lordships, both in Office and in Opposition, that it is not open to an English Party so to carry its opinion into practice as to break away from a policy which Parliament and the people of this country have, after due deliberation, laid down. That Act of 1881 has passed; it has been acted upon; it is part of the policy of Ireland, and I wish to say this, in order that it may not be imputed to me as an inconsistency, that I do not see on what other theory of procedure Government by Party is possible in this country. The Act of 1881 was a compromise and bargain, and I should have been very glad at the time if the landlords had resisted it; but, as a matter of fact, they did not resist it. They resisted partly, but they were content that the Act should pass. Whether they liked it or not, they did not think it right that an Act which was desired by vast numbers of Irishmen, and of which great things were hoped, should be hindered by their objections. I therefore say that this bargain, such as it was, they accepted, and that bargain is one which I think Parliament is bound to observe. The bargain was this—the landlords were deprived of that to which they had an undoubted right—namely, the power of changing their tenants or taking their lands into their own hands, and fixing their own rents in the open market. In place of that power, in consideration of that sacrifice, they were offered for 15 years a fixity of rent, which under all circumstances they were to receive. Now that bargain, in one sense, has been unfulfilled. The landlords do not receive the rents—the judicial rents—that have been fixed by the Courts. I do not say that they receive them nowhere; but in many parts of Ireland they do not receive them. What is the cause of that failure? My Lords, I think that is a subject, among many others, which we are bound to investigate with very great care. Undoubtedly the first and most obvious reason why they have not received their rents is that there exist illegal combinations for the purpose of preventing the payment of rents—which hinder even those who are able and willing to pay their rents from doing so. With these illegal combinations it is our duty to grapple. We hear of them in every direction. Everybody must have heard numberless stories of the occupants of estates previously contented and willing to pay rent suddenly demoralized by the advent of the Nationalist Leaders, and persuaded to refuse the obligations which they were ready to carry out. Everybody must have heard stories of tenants forced to pretend that they did not pay their rent, yet wishing honestly to discharge the obligations they had incurred, meeting their landlords privately, and giving them the rent, and entreating them to give them no receipt for it. All these things exist, I am afraid, in many parts of Ireland. They prove the great force exercised upon the tenants by these illegal combinations, and in justice to both tenants and landlords we are bound to seek to probe the evil, to see how far it spreads, and to examine what remedies we can apply to it. We propose to issue a Commission for that purpose. At the same time there is another matter we must also inquire into. It is loudly said that the cause of non-payment of rent, at all events in some parts of Ireland, is that the tenants cannot pay, because the price of produce has fallen so low that the payment of rent has become impossible. I have great doubts whether that is true to a great extent, and I doubt it for two reasons. In the first place, the fall in price of produce which has taken place in this country—a fall which has created so profound a depression in agriculture—is a fall chiefly in wheat and barley, two grains which Ireland does not to a very great extent grow. There has, no doubt, been a fall in the price of stock; but that appears to be recovering itself. There is one article of produce in which I am told the depreciation has been very considerable—I mean butter. Whether that depreciation is due to a fall in the price in the market, or whether it is owing to the troublous times the manufacturer has, is a matter which, I think, is open to controversy; but, undoubtedly, there has been a fall in that article. But though that is the case, I am not at all sure that the judicial rents were not fixed with a perfect consciousness on the part of the Judges that a fall in the price was going on. That fall has been going on now for several years, and it is highly improbable that the Courts, in assigning judicial rents, have not taken that into consideration. However, I think that, considering this matter has been stated so loudly and on such high authority, and considering that if we were to refuse an inquiry we should be accused of neglect—I think it ought also to be a subject for investigation by Commission; but in saying this I wish to guard myself against one misapprehension—we do not contemplate any revision of the judicial rents. We do not think it would be honest, in the first place, and we think it would be exceedingly inexpedient. If you announce a revision of judicial rents, you practically destroy all hopes of finality in agricultural questions. Neither landlord nor tenant will be able to count on the legislation of the future with the slightest glimpse of certainty. The tenants will constantly have before them the belief, and the landlords will constantly have before them the fear, that, under the pressure of some future agitation or in the light of some future controversy, Parliament may be forced to fresh legislation; and that confidence, that repose, that rest, which my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) said is the one thing which this country, and especially Ireland, needs will be indefinitely postponed. But if it should turn out that the Courts have made blunders, and that there is that impossibility in any case of paying rent, I think it is not the landlords who should bear the loss. I think this would be one of the cases for the application of the principle of purchase by the State, and that the State, and not the landlords, must suffer for the errors that have been made. The question of policy does not arise at present; but it is so common in Ireland to exaggerate that which is being done or intended that I thought it necessary to guard myself in giving any countenance to the idea that any remission of judicial rents was in our contemplation. My Lords, I mentioned the system of purchase, and the Commission that has been proposed will have that question principally in view. I do not think that its most earnest advocates can say that the Act of 1881 has solved the Land Question. I believe it is far more true to say, as the Marquess of Hartington said at the time it was passed, that it was only a *modus vivendi* until a sounder principle could be introduced. The duality of ownership is not consistent with the prosperity of the country. We cannot, of course, go back to the system which existed before the Act of 1881. We must go forward to that sounder system which consists in converting the judicial leaseholder into a freeholder as fast as we can. Of course, this can only be done by degrees and tentatively—it cannot be done suddenly by any heroic act; but we think that great good may arise from pushing further our inquiries into this subject, and ascertaining how far legislation already passed has succeeded in this respect, and whether it is not possible, by bringing to our aid the credit of the Local Authorities, especially in congested districts, to push the process a little further, and to make greater strides towards bringing the tenure of land in Ireland into a healthy condition. I do not believe that any tinkering with the land system will have the slightest effect until we can get rid of the duality of ownership which the Land Act of 1881 introduced. I believe, as a consequence of that, in the opinions which many have expressed in this House, that in the peculiar circumstances of Ireland the multiplication of freeholders will be a blessing and security for all who live in that country, and a solution of all the political questions with which we have had lately to deal, to an extent which must make us anxious to push forward every means of bringing such an improved state of things into existence, and which can only be limited by the financial difficulties which undoubtedly exist. It is for the purpose of throwing light upon that question of financial difficulty, and aiding us in removing the obstacles to this much wished for and necessary reform, that we shall appoint this Commission. From this statement, my Lords, it will appear that I am not at present prepared to indicate any legislative policy—that, as far as legislation goes, our action is one of examination and inquiry, and, as far as executive administrative acts are concerned, we have already done our best to enforce the law. We intend to continue in that path, to restore social order, secure all existing rights, and to give back to Ireland the repose which she needs. I will only further say that in all the efforts we shall make in this direction we shall consider ourselves strictly limited, and shall take care that all our legislation is inspired by the decision—the great and critical decision—of the constituencies upon the great issue that has been submitted to them. We exist as a Ministry to maintain the Union. The condition of the maintenance of the Union is the restoration of social order, and to the path so traced we shall unswervingly adhere.

Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS appointed, *nemine dissentiente,* to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES — Appointed.

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS—Appointed.

APPEAL COMMITTEE—Appointed.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, to
Monday the 30th instant, a
quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 19*th August*, 1886.

The House met at a quarter before Two of the clock.

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill, *for* Paddington (South Division).

Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet, *for* Bristol (West Division).

Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners, *for* Leicester (Melton Division).

Right honble. Henry Matthews, *for* Birmingham (East Division).

Right honble. William Henry Smith, *for* Strand.

Right honble. Edward Stanhope, *for* Lincoln County (South Lindsey or Horncastle Division).

Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton, *for* Middlesex (Ealing Division).

Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes, *for* Cambridge University.

Right honble. David Robert Plunket, *for* Dublin University.

Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie, *for* Tower Hamlets (St. George's Division).

Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet, *for* Hampstead.

Sir Richard Webster, *for* Isle of Wight.

Edward George Clarke, esquire, *for* Plymouth.

Right honble. Hugh Holmes, *for* Dublin University.

John George Gibson, esquire, *for* Liverpool (Walton Division).

Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone, *for* Middlesex (Enfield Divison).

Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, esquire, *for* Sheffield (Ecclesall Division).

Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald, *for* Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities.

James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire, *for* Bute County.

Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham, *for* Lewisham.

Right honble. Arthur James Balfour, *for* Manchester (East Division).

Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott, *for* Brighton.

Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond, *for* Devon County (Tiverton Division).

Honble. Sidney Herbert, *for* Croydon.

Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet, *for* Wigtown County.

Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill, *for* County Down (West Down Division).

Captain Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford, *for* Marylebone (East Division).

Honble. Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley, *for* Northampton County (Northern Division).

Thomas Wodehouse Leigh, esquire, *for* South West Lancashire (Newton Division).

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one other Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW WRIT ISSUED.

For King's Lynn, *v.* The Right honble. Robert Bourke, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies.

ELECTIONS.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT — SESSIONAL ORDERS— INTERFERENCE OF PEERS IN ELECTIONS.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom, for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament."

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I venture to ask the House not to assent to the renewal of the last of the Sessional Orders which you, Sir, have just read to the House; and I ask them not to assent to it on this ground—that the Sessional Order has been disobeyed and infringed without regard to Party; that it has been disregarded and infringed by Peers of both Parties for the last 40 or 50 years. In various cases, when such infringement has been brought before the House, I think I shall be able to show that the House has practically said either that it was powerless to enforce its own Resolution, or that it did not think it wise to endeavour to give force to it. Now, Sir, I submit respectfully to the House that it is beneath its dignity to continue to renew a Form which is no longer practically applicable to the political circumstances of this country. I know of no reason why a Peer, so far as the political strife of this country is concerned, should be placed in any inferior position to any other citizen in the State; and I propose to show, very briefly, that at the last Election this Sessional Order was absolutely disobeyed and wilfully disobeyed—that is to say, that the Peers who have disobeyed it, by the language they used, showed that they clearly knew of the existence of the Sessional Order, and clearly knew that they were disobeying it. I shall, further, be able to show the House that since some notice has been taken by the Press that the matter was likely to be considered by this House to-day one of the Peers to whom I refer has intimated that whatever may be the decision of this House—I am not using his own words, but I am stating the sense of what he says—namely, that whatever the decision of this House may be he shall continue to act as he has hitherto done. Allow me, Sir, to enumerate the instances in which the infringement I complain of has occurred. In the first place, the Sessional Order has been disobeyed by Peers who have presided at election meetings after the issue of the Writ. Perhaps I may be permitted to say, once for all, that the infringement of the Sessional Order might be complained of whether it occurred before or after the issue of the Writ; but I am content to confine myself to cases which have occurred after the issue of the Writ. I have no wish to weary the House with the details of many cases; but I desire to point out that Peers have spoken at election meetings in favour of particular candidates; that they have signed circulars delivered to voters after the issue of the Writ—the circulars being dated before the issue—urging upon the voters to vote for particular candidates. In some cases Peers have called upon and canvassed voters to vote for particular candidates; in other cases they have written letters in the nature of semi-private letters in order to influence the voters in favour of a particular candidate. They have further infringed the Sessional Order by lending their carriages and servants to convey voters to the poll. The instances of infringement in the last case are so numerous that they must be within the knowledge of every Member of the House, no matter on which side he happens to sit, and therefore I will not specify the particular instances. The first case which I desire to mention is that of the Earl of Sandwich, who, in South Huntingdonshire, attended election meetings, and spoke on behalf of one of the candidates. Since the Election there was a rejoicing demonstration at his seat, Hinchingbrooke Park, at which the noble Earl used this language—

> "In spite of Mr. Bradlaugh, I venture to assert that I, as an Englishman, have a right to have a deep feeling as to how the country is to be governed. In spite, then, of the Motion which Mr. Bradlaugh proposes to bring before the House of Commons, when I find that a despotic Minister is endeavouring, contrary to the views of all his late and trusted friends, to ruin the country, I shall do my duty in striving for what I consider to be the welfare of the Empire."

This noble Earl claims that he is entitled to mix in the election of Members of the House of Commons, and to determine who shall be the Minister chosen by the vote of a majority of this House by contributing either to send Members in or to keep them out. Another case is that of the Duke of Hamilton, and I believe this is not his first experience in connection with Parliamentary Elections. At the last Election he worked very hard in Buteshire. On a previous occasion I am informed that he devoted the whole of one day to the performance of the duty of an extra poll clerk outside a polling station, where he kept a list of the voters as they went in. Unfortunately, this taking notice of the voters as they went in to poll was not so harmless a matter as it may appear, but many of the voters were his Grace's tenants, and they were not uninfluenced by his presence, because there was a conviction among them, whether rightly or wrongly, that their livelihood depended more or less upon his Grace's favour; and if the House thinks fit to decide against me in this question, I certainly think it will be its duty to make this case a matter of Privilege which ought to be inquired into, in order to ascertain how far the election in Buteshire was influenced by the conduct of his Grace the Duke of Hamilton. The next case is that of the Duke of Argyll, who has written letters to the newspapers in connection with the elections for Argyllshire and the borough of Inverness. One letter was written by his Grace to the officials taking part in the election with the view of influencing electors as to the way in which they ought to vote. The Earl of Leicester attended more than one meeting, and spoke against the candidature of the hon. Gentleman who was returned for the Freebridge Division of Norfolk in the last Parliament (Mr. Joseph Arch). The noble Earl went into the election with all the vigour and enthusiasm of a man who might have been desirous of winning a seat for himself. I am not blaming the noble Earl for that at all. I do not think that what we allow to a coal-heaver in this country, and to almost every ordinary worker in every class of life, although we refuse it to a policeman, we should deny to any nobleman, and it is for that reason I ask the House not to assent to this Sessional Order. I find that Earl Cowper presided after the issue of the Writ at a meeting in favour of the candidature of the noble Viscount who is now Member for the Biggleswade Division of Bedfordshire (Viscount Baring). Lord Wantage took an active part in the North Berkshire Election against the candidature of a particular gentleman. The Duke of Norfolk attended numerous meetings in South Islington and in Penryn and Falmouth, at some of which he acted as Chairman. Lord Bramwell and Viscount Sherbrooke signed a circular to the electors of Chelsea, a copy of which I hold in my hand. The bulk of these circulars, if not the whole of them, were delivered after the Writ was received by the Returning Officer; and in the circular itself the electors—Liberal, Radical, and Conservative—are called upon to vote for a Gentleman who is now a Member of this House. ["Hear, hear!"] Yes; it is because I think that noble Lords should have that opportunity; because I think it is a farce for this House to say that they shall not have it, and then for noble Lords to reply that they will have it, that I now ask the House not to stultify itself by adopting this Sessional Order. The Earl of Northbrook personally called upon and canvassed voters in North Bedfordshire. I have already told the House that I should give instances altogether without regard to political Parties. I find that the Marquess of Ripon introduced candidates at Oldham; that the Earl of Jersey attended a meeting in the Banbury Division of Oxfordshire, and then there is a somewhat curious case in connection with Lord Belper. Lord Belper seems to have thought that after the Writ was issued he had no right to interfere, and he wrote a letter to the election agent of one of the candidates stating that as the

Writ had been issued he could not interfere; but he hoped that all the electors would vote for Mr. Charles Seely. I do not propose to trespass upon the attention of the House with any other instances; but I have no doubt that the cases I have enumerated may be supplemented by many others. [*Cries of* "Wolverton."] I have only submitted cases which I have been able to verify. There are a large number which I have not been able to verify; but I shall be very happy to receive further evidence from the other side of the House after I have concluded my remarks. The matter is one which has been discussed over and over again in previous Parliaments; but I believe that only one decision has been come to. I only propose to trouble the House with two instances in which the matter was discussed. The last occasion was on the 23rd of February, 1880, when Mr. A. M. Sullivan, who was then a Member of the House, moved that the conduct of Earl Cadogan was a Breach of Privilege. The Previous Question was then moved by the right hon. Gentleman who is now Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) on the ground—

"That these Motions of Breach of Privilege apply to matters which you cannot restrain,"

and the House carried the Previous Question. The right hon. Gentleman, on a previous occasion, which occurred a short time before, took the same course, and the House endorsed it by a large vote. In 1847 another case was fully discussed in this House, and a large number of precedents were collected by the learned Attorney General for the time being — Sir John Jervis — who quoted, among other instances, the case of Earl Cawdor, when the Member who had raised it had taunted the House of Commons with the inutility of barking where they could not bite. On that occasion, also, the House decided not to take any action. Sir John Jervis cited about 20 cases which had been before the House, all of which ended in nothing. Then I would ask whether the House ought to renew a Sessional Order which has always been utterly disregarded, and which in the late General Election was treated as naught? I would ask if it is consistent with the dignity of the House to keep repeating a form of words to which it gives no effect whatever? The whole of the precedents were collected by the late Sir Erskine May, and will be found on pages 719 and 720 of his very valuable book. If the House is now prepared to renew the Sessional Order, is it prepared to enforce it? I believe I have furnished evidence to the House to show that the Sessional Order is now disregarded and infringed. Is the House prepared to take proceedings in the matter? Is it prepared to summon any one of the Peers I have mentioned to attend at the Bar of the House? Is it prepared to bring itself in conflict with the other House in the event of a Peer neglecting to obey its Order? If not, the whole thing is a farce, and I would ask the Liberal and Radical Members who sit on this side of the House, for I make sure that hon. Gentlemen on the other side, who have volunteered already to supply me with additional evidence, will vote with me—I ask my Liberal Friends on this side to consider whether it is not better to say that this Sessional Order should not be renewed than to renew it and then to allow the Peers to do what they please? Personally, I see no reason why the Peers should not do what they please. I think it would be far better for the Peers to do what they please openly and fairly in this country than for this House to say they have no right, and then to shut its eyes and ears when the Peers treat their Order as if it were a mere farce. I would not ask the House to abandon any of its old Forms if it showed any disposition to enforce them; but it shows no disposition to enforce them; and I maintain that it is unworthy of the House to continue to pass this Order. If the Government—the powerful Government now in Office, so ably led, as I have no doubt it will be when the occasion arises—if the House, so ably led, pledges itself to enforce this Sessional Order, then, as a mere private Member, I have nothing more to say. I shall object to the renewal of the Sessional Order, and if the Sessional Order be renewed I think I am speaking within the Rules of the House when I say that every one of the cases I have mentioned may be brought before the House as a Breach of Privilege. I submit that each case ought to be brought before the House as a case of Breach of Privilege; and if each of these cases only takes some two or three hours to discuss, I will ask Members of the Government, who may have some concern for the disposal of the time of the House, whether they intend to have those cases investigated? If they say no—that they intend to renew the Sessional Order, but do not intend to enforce it—if they say that, then I maintain that they have no right to renew the Order, and I will take the liberty of asking the House to divide against it. Surely the most dignified course will be for the House not to repeat a form of words which has no longer any real meaning, and to which they are not prepared to give effect. I hope the House will declare that it will be no party to the putting of a sham upon its Order Book, which it has neither the will nor the intention to enforce.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not be put to the trouble of a division, because the prospect which has been held out by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) is a very appalling one. We are not likely to have too much time for getting through the regular Business of the House; and if our time is to be occupied in going through all these cases of the conduct of impenitent Peers, I think the Session will be likely to go on much longer than we wish. I beg leave, however, to second the Motion of the hon. Member; but I do not wish to waste the time of the House in doing so, because we are all anxious to hear—as, no doubt, we shall very shortly—a statement as to what the policy of the new Government is. I second the Motion on the ground of justice. I belong to a Society for the abolition of the House of Lords; but I wish to do justice to all Her Majesty's subjects, even the very meanest of them; and I think that, under the present Sessional Order which you, Sir, have read out from the Chair, a certain injustice is done to Peers of the Realm. In what position do they now stand? They are in the House of Lords, and they are strictly prohibited by the Constitution from taking any part in taxation. They are, however, very large taxpayers, and as they are not allowed to vote for those who have to control the taxation of the country, theirs is, consequently, a case of taxation without representation, and on that ground I feel sure I shall get the support of hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side, for it is on account of their determination not to dissociate representation from taxation that they defeated the late Prime Minister, and that they are now sitting on that side of the House. My other reason for opposing this Sessional Order is that the whole thing is a sham. We pass a solemn Rule in this House, and we know perfectly well that we are not going to enforce it. My opinion is that, both in the country and in this House, there are quite enough organized hypocrisies, without adding another.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): There is one feature about this Motion which the whole House will agree is very pleasant and very agreeable, and that is that it has given to the hon. Baronet the Member for the Cockermouth Division of Cumberland (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) an opportunity of reminding the House that the House is once more enlivened by his genial presence and his shrewd humour and wisdom. No one, I think, on this side of the House, at any rate, is prepared to feel anything but satisfaction at the presence again of the hon. Baronet. There was one remark which fell from the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh), which I hardly think he intended to apply as a threat, because it was a remark which would, I think, be likely to indispose a great many Members of the House from supporting his Motion. I am certain I am speaking correctly when I say it was of a character to prejudice the Motion itself. If I understand the hon. Member for Northampton aright, he intimated that, in case the House did not entirely and immediately agree with the views he had expressed in regard to the Sessional Order, he would deem it his duty to obstruct the proceedings of the House night after night. [Mr. BRADLAUGH: No!] I understood that to be the meaning of the hon. Member, and I am bound to take notice of it.

MR. BRADLAUGH: If my language conveyed that impression, it was not the language I intended to use.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Then I will apologize for putting a wrong construction on the language of the hon. Member. It certainly occurred to me and my Colleagues that that interpretation might be placed on the hon. Member's remarks. The hon. Member contends that this Sessional Order has been disobeyed. I wish that the argument on that point could be left to the dialectic skill of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition; because obviously the whole question, whether the Order is disobeyed or not, turns on the meaning which the House is disposed to put on the expression that no Peer shall "concern" himself with the election of any Member. You may put on that expression a very narrow meaning or a very broad meaning. It might almost be limited to the Resolution of the House that no Peer should vote in any election, or should take any active part in the holding of an election. On the other hand, you might put so broad a construction upon it that no Peer would be allowed to express his opinion on public affairs except in the House of Lords. I myself should be inclined to put a narrow meaning upon that word "concerning." I am disposed to think that there is some value about this Sessional Order, which the House will do well not to abandon hastily. I cannot help noticing that the hon. Member himself adduced a singular instance of the moral restraint which it does exercise on Peers, because he quoted the case of Lord Belper, who wrote a public letter to the effect that on account of this Order he could not in any way interfere with a certain election. But in order not to weary the House I would suggest what is the view which the Government take of this Order. I think that the proposal of the hon. Member is somewhat too rough and ready, though I admit that there is a great deal that is sound and weighty in what fell from him. I think it is not, perhaps, advisable that the House of Commons should preserve Forms which may be proved to be what he has called "shams." But the great thing is to be absolutely certain, before we part with any of these old Forms, that they are shams. Upon that point I cannot help thinking that the view I have expressed will be supported by hon. Gentlemen opposite—namely, that the House of Commons should be very careful and cautious in dealing with these old Forms; and that such a rough and ready course as is proposed by the hon. Member is not necessarily the wisest course which this House could take. There is no doubt that the form of the Order is antiquated, and that it was intended to apply to a state of circumstances which has to a considerable extent become obsolete. The hon. Member proposes that the House should decide between these two alternatives; whether we shall try to enforce the Order rigidly, or altogether abandon it. I would suggest to the hon. Member that there is a third course, and I would support that course by this further suggestion—that whatever the House of Commons does in the matter, it would be well if it could be done unanimously by the entire sense of the whole House of Commons. Therefore, the third course is, in opposition to rigid enforcement or total repeal, that we should appoint a Committee to examine—[*A laugh*]—I believe that course is strictly in accordance with former precedents when questions of this kind have been raised. There used to be a Committee called "the Committee of Privileges" which has now ceased to be nominated. But I am of opinion that it would not be unwise to allow the Sessional Order to remain for the present, and that in consequence of the remarks which have been made by the hon. Member, and of the views of those who agree with him, we should early next Session appoint a Committee analogous to the Committee of Privileges to examine carefully the effect of this Order, and to decide whether it has any effect at all, and whether it would be wise in any way to revise or modify the Order to meet the altered circumstances of the times. That is the course which I respectfully suggest to the House should be taken with regard to the Sessional Order and the Motion of the hon. Member. I think that no controversy ought to arise on a matter of this kind. I am only pleading that on account of my attachment to the old Forms of the House we should proceed with caution and care, and I trust that the hon. Member will not feel discontented or dissatisfied with the suggestion I have made to him.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I venture to hope that the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) will not accept the suggestion of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The noble Lord proposes a Committee of Inquiry. I must remark upon that that it is somewhat singular and significant that a Committee of Inquiry should be proposed at this very early date as the means of meeting difficult questions. I wish also to make a remark upon another observation which fell from the noble Lord. The noble Lord attributed to the hon. Member for Northampton a desire to obstruct the proceedings of the House. But I hope that my hon. Friend will not, in that respect, follow the bad example of the Fourth Party, now happily deceased. If my hon. Friend were to imitate the proceedings of that Party, I am afraid he would lay himself open to the charge of the noble Lord. The noble Lord, no doubt, entirely disapproves now of the proceedings and strategy of the Fourth Party. Another reason why I object to the proposal of the noble Lord to postpone any action upon this question is that the elections are fresh in our memories; and the sooner we bring the Government face to face with their actions and pledges during the elections, the better opportunity there will be of making them stand by those acts and pledges. I am rather afraid that if we leave any matter over for three or four months the Government will forget their pledges, and when hon. Members return they will be alarmed to find the enormous chasm that exists between their pledges at election time and their performances. The General Election has just taken place, and the acts of the noble Lord and of his Party are fresh in our memories. Let us then proceed with the matter now, and not put it off until the time when the noble Lord will be able to say that all these things are ancient history. All I say is that the sooner we act in the matter the better. I hope my hon. Friend will go to a division at once, if only to show how far hon. Members sitting on the Opposition Benches are prepared to support the Government in shelving disagreeable questions.

Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): I think everyone must feel—and it was frankly admitted by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer—that there is very great force in many of the considerations that have been raised by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) in favour of the abolition of this Sessional Order. It is not easy to make a case in argument for maintaining what purports to be a law—which law we have no disposition to enforce strictly—which probably we have not the power to enforce strictly, and which is, undoubtedly, to a very considerable extent, either neglected or absolutely trodden under foot. At the same time, these are considerations which ought to be brought before the House in connection with the subject. Does the House think that, with the present constitution of Parliament, and with the great powers and privileges attaching to Peers, as an order, which gives them complete control over the legislation of this House — does the House think that it is desirable to encourage persons who are invested with these remarkable privileges to increase a practice which undoubtedly, to some extent, prevails of interference in popular elections? I think, Sir, I have made candid admissions to the hon. Member for Northampton; and I think he will, on his part, admit that the abolition of the Sessional Order would, to a certain extent, be interpreted in the country as an entire withdrawal by the House of Commons of all expressions of disapprobation against the interference of the Lords in popular elections, and would almost act altogether as an expression of opinion on the part of the House of Commons that Peers ought so to interfere. Therefore, Sir, I think undoubtedly that if we are of opinion that the renewal of the Sessional Order, or a non-renewal of the Sessional Order, would have the effect of increasing this practice of interference, we cannot avoid looking at the question and forming our own judgment upon it, whether it is desirable to encourage and to bring about an increase of interference of that kind. Then, Sir, there is another view of the case. Although it is entirely inadmissible in this House to impute motives to hon. Members, yet I think we may impute reasons; and, looking to the fact that my hon. Friend (Sir Wilfrid Lawson)—whom I congratulate heartily on his return to this House, as I congratulate the House in respect of it—who seconded the Motion, distinctly admitted that he did so because he was prepared to support the abolition of the House of Lords, it appears to me that the abolition of the Sessional Order and the broad adoption of the principle that Peers may be equally concerned in popular elections with Commoners, is in the nature of laying the first parallel in that siege which is, at some time or in some circumstances, to be laid against the House of Lords and its present exclusive Privileges. That is a question on which, at the present moment, I do not give any opinion beyond this. Anything that has to be done in that matter ought to be done by us with our eyes open, and with a view of the purposes to which it is really intended to be directed, and not as a matter of mere form, as if it were of little importance. My position, Sir, is this—that in a case of this kind we ought to pay considerable deference to the views of the Executive Government. The Executive Government has long been, and I think is becoming more and more, from the necessities of the case, a sort of constituted guardian of the Privileges of this House; and any opinion given by them in a case of difficulty ought, therefore, to receive considerable attention from the House, and starts with a certain presumption in its favour. If it is the opinion of the Government that it would not be wise to abolish the Sessional Order by a vote of the House, I myself should be inclined to vote with them on that question. But I must notice slightly the proposal of the noble Lord, which is that the consideration of the subject for that purpose should be referred to a Committee. Now, Sir, I find the House is still in the regular practice of voting that a Committee of Privileges shall be appointed; but of late years it has not been usual to nominate the Committee of Privileges. But, inasmuch as it is quite plain that the House so far supports the noble Lord as to consider its Privileges to be a fit subject to refer to such a Committee by passing a Sessional Order to that effect—that being so, I am inclined to think it would be the wiser, and simpler, and more natural course to allow this question to be referred to that Committee, and that we should proceed to appoint and to nominate persons to serve on the Committee for this purpose. I can quite understand why questions of general interest cannot be conveniently or fitly entertained in a Session of this kind; but the subject we are now discussing assumes the nature of a preliminary condition. Looking at the action of the House, and recollecting the general practice, I would say that if there is to be a Reference to a Committee, the Reference had better be to the Committee which the House of Commons already, in principle, adopts, although recently there may not have been occasion to nominate Members to serve upon it. Whatever view the Government may take of that suggestion, my disposition is to accept the authority of the Government with regard to our vote on the Motion made by the hon. Member for Northampton—the question obviously being one of difficulty. In theory there is undoubtedly a strong case against the Sessional Order; but, on the other hand, it appears not altogether irrational to suppose that the abolition of it might be followed by an increase of a practice which many of us may not be inclined to approve. For my own part, I confess that, although I do not think it very desirable to encourage the practice, it is quite evident that some limitation is imposed by the Sessional Order on the action of Peers. I may state that a number of noble Lords with whom I am acquainted did on principle, if I may say so, very strictly observe that Order. Among them was my noble Friend Lord Wolverton, who had undoubtedly been acting in various matters bearing upon the elections at an earlier period, but who, however, only humbly imitated the practice very much more largely followed by Gentlemen on the other side. I do not wish to dwell on that matter. I only say this to show that there is a certain amount of effect produced by this Sessional Order, and that it must not be considered as one that is altogether shadowy and unsubstantial. If the matter is pressed to a division, I shall vote with the Government against the abolition of the Order.

Mr. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee): I would venture to say, Sir, that the reasons which the right hon. Gentleman have given for opposing the Motion are the very reasons why we who support it desire that it should be passed. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that if the Motion is passed it will be regarded in the country as an encouragement to Peers to concern themselves in elections. That is one of the very things which the supporters of the Motion want to bring about. The right hon. Gentleman also said that it bears another aspect, and that the state of things resulting from the abolition of the Sessional Order would be used as a first means of attack against the hereditary character of the House of Lords. Well, that also is one of the things which we had in view in bringing the Motion forward. There is one consideration I should like to put before the House before I sit down. I want hon. Members to consider how this question has been dealt with by the House in past times. In connection with the West Gloucestershire Election in 1847, the Attorney General of that day, Sir John Jervis, laid before the House the whole of the precedents bearing upon this Sessional Order, and what was the result? This Sessional Order was 200 years old, and it had never been effectively enforced except in one case, in which a Bishop was the delinquent. All that happened to the Bishop was that he was deprived of some minor office which he filled in connection with the Court. That was the only case in which the Sessional Order was put in force. In 1780 the Duke of Chandos was charged with having infringed the Order, and, after the fashion suggested by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Committee was appointed to inquire into the case. The Committee found the Duke of Chandos guilty; but the House declined to interfere. In the same year a charge was made against the Duke of Bolton of undue interference; but the House, being better informed than it was in the previous case, took no notice of the matter. In 1840 a similar charge was preferred against Lord Cawdor, and again the House refused to take notice of it, being convinced that it was perfectly useless to bark where they dared not bite. For a considerable number of years the House of Commons has been barking without attempting to bite. Perhaps it will not surprise the House to hear that among the Peers who from time to time have been charged with infringing this Order two of the most conspicuous have borne the titles of Duke of Marlborough and Marquess of Salisbury. In the year 1845 the Duke of Marlborough was charged with disobeying the Order four times in 18 months, in promoting the election of members of his own family in the borough of Woodstock. That borough, I believe, has now disappeared, and with its extinction has disappeared the chance of any future Duke of Marlborough repeating the offence. In 1880 this Sessional Order was again brought before the House, when the House, under the lead of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) distinctly pronounced it imprudent, impracticable, and impossible to enforce the Order. That being the view of the House, I hope it will no longer continue to stultify itself, but that, by saying "No" to this Sessional Order, it will declare that it no longer intends to keep upon its Books an Order which it has neither the courage nor the will to enforce.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 294; Noes 126: Majority 168.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

Resolved, That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery or other corrupt practices.

WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime and misdemeanor; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

OUTLAWRIES BILL.

Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

—o—

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): It may be to the convenience of the House that I should give Notice now that after the conclusion of the debate on the Address I will move—

"That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed.

"That the Standing Order, No. 21, relating to Notices on going into Committee of Supply on Monday and Thursday be extended to the other days of the week."

QUESTIONS.

—o—

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—DURATION OF THE SESSION.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): In view of the Notice given by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I think it will be most convenient for many hon. Members to know whether the Government have really made up their minds as to whether it is their intention to prorogue Parliament as soon as the Financial Business has been concluded?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Yes, Sir; that is our intention.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland two Questions, of which I have given him private Notice, with respect to the condition of social order in Belfast. The first is, What are the intentions of the Government with regard to a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Catholics of Belfast on the 16th instant, protesting against the proposal to withdraw the extra police force from that town, and to substitute stipendiary magistrates for the ordinary justices, on the ground that the adoption of these suggestions would be disastrous to the peace of the town and would endanger the lives of the people? The second Question is, Who are to be the additional Members whom the Government intend to appoint on the Royal Commission of Inquiry in regard to the Belfast riots?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I was not aware that Questions would be asked to-day, and I did not receive Notice of the first Question of the hon. Member at all. If he will put it down upon the Paper, I will endeavour to answer it another day; but I rather gather that it relates to a condition of things in Belfast that is past. With regard to the second Question, I may say our intention is to strengthen the Commission appointed by the late Government, and to extend the scope of its inquiry. We do not intend to substitute a Royal Commission for the Commission of the Lord Lieutenant, for the simple reason that no additional powers would be given by the change. We are considering in what way the full and searching inquiry which everybody desires can best be secured, and with regard to that matter whether it would be well for us to apply to Parliament for power to be given to the Commissioners to take evidence upon oath. The House is aware that, without Parliamentary sanction, that power cannot be conferred upon the Commissioners.

MR. SEXTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman expect to be able to give the names of the additional Commissioners to-morrow?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, Sir; I do not think that I shall be able to do that so soon.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to state to-morrow in what respect he proposes to enlarge the scope of the inquiry ordered by the late Government?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes, Sir; I think I could do so.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—VOTES IN SUPPLY.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will cause a statement to be circulated amongst the Members of the House showing what Votes, or parts of Votes, remain to be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): I will see that that is done.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* Her Majesty's Speech, made by Her Chancellor, and read it to the House.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[FIRST NIGHT.]

Colonel KING-HARMAN (Kent, Isle of Thanet) (who wore the uniform of a Lord Lieutenant) said: In rising to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament, although I am not able to ask the indulgence which is usually accorded by the House to the Mover of the Address, on the ordinary ground that I am a new Member addressing it for the first time, still I crave the indulgence which the House always accords, on the ground that although I have on more than one occasion addressed the House I have never set myself up as a speechmaker, and I have never unduly occupied its time. I feel that in moving the Address on this occasion I have a task before me which might tax the abilities of a much more able and practised speaker than myself. Sir, Her Majesty's Gracious Speech is brief; very brief indeed; but I think the reasons for that brevity are not far to seek, and that they may be found within the limits of the Speech itself. In introducing the Address which I have the honour to move, I do not intend to trespass long upon the patience of hon. Members.

Sir, it will be noticed that no question of foreign policy arises in the course of Her Majesty's Speech, and this, I trust, will be satisfactory to the House generally, and especially to hon. Members who sit opposite. It points out, in my humble opinion, that the foreign policy of this country, inaugurated by great men who have gone before and carried out with foreign countries, and especially with the nations of Europe, with hardly an exception, for many generations, the policy pursued by Pitt and by Palmerston, and a short time ago with marked success and ability by Lord Rosebery, still continues, and I hope will ever continue, to meet Her Majesty's approval. It also shows that, in spite of exceptional difficulties in Burmah and other portions of Her Majesty's Dominions which might otherwise have claimed the serious attention of the House, the administration of Lord Dufferin and the other Plenipotentiary Ministers to whom the conduct of affairs has been entrusted commands the confidence of Her Majesty.

The question of Supply occupies the foremost place in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. When I say that the Estimates shortly to be laid before the House were framed by the late Government, and that in all the discussions which took place in the last Parliament on Votes on Account, or other cognate matters, these Estimates received the support of right hon. Gentlemen who now hold the Seals of Office; and when I say, further, that the Estimates and Votes on Account have never, to an appreciable extent, been opposed by any section of the House in the last Parliament, I hope we may anticipate that no long time will elapse before the House will grant the Supply which is pointed out in Her Majesty's Speech as being necessary. Although no duty of the House of Commons is more important than that of carefully criticizing any measure or matter relating to the taxation of the country, it is also, when that duty has been carried out, manifestly the duty of the House to vote the Supplies necessary for the service of the country, and to do so with as little delay as possible. From the Notice given by my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer I hope there is every reason to anticipate that this will be the case, and that the Session which we are now entering upon will not be a very long one. The nation requires rest after the arduous and serious political struggle in which it has been engaged for so many months. Hon. Members on both sides of the House may reasonably hope for some interval of relaxation, and for a clearly marked-out time which they may devote to businesses and pursuits other than political ones.

It appears to me, also, that it is only just and reasonable that some little time should be afforded to Her Majesty's Government in which they may consider the state of affairs, foreign and domestic, and weigh carefully the measures which they may see fit to introduce in a future Session for the peace, prosperity, and welfare of Her Majesty's subjects abroad and at home. In the latter category the question of Ireland stands pre-eminent. As Her Majesty has reminded the House, the late Parliament was dissolved in order that the opinion of the nation might be taken upon grave questions with regard to the government of Ireland, which were placed before the House by the late Government. The constituencies have responded with no uncertain voice in support of the opposition which the present holders of the Seals of Government offered to the proposals brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). Sir, I am glad that Her Majesty does not at present recommend that Parliament should proceed in this Session to pass measures for the government of Ireland other than those which suffice for the preservation of peace and order in England and Scotland. I am convinced that Her Majesty's Advisers have carefully considered the state of Ireland, and that they are thoroughly aware of the responsibility which they undertake in attempting to govern that country, for the present, at any rate, by the ordinary processes of the law. Sir, it is my belief that the ordinary law of the land, if carefully and firmly carried out in a perfectly strict and impartial manner, will suffice for the preservation of peace and order in Ireland. I am, however, aware that that depends very largely upon those whose counsels have of late had such great weight with the larger portion of the population of the three Southern Provinces. The responsibility, therefore, as to whether Her Majesty's Government shall continue to rely upon the ordinary law for the preservation of law and order in Ireland rests upon those Gentlemen in a very great degree. If, unfortunately, evil counsels should prevail, and the agitation which has flourished so long in Ireland should be continued with the effect of prolonging the state of anarchy and misrule, I feel sure that the Government will not hesitate to call Parliament together, and submit measures by which the supremacy of the law may be maintained. I trust, Sir, that such a necessity may not arise. I am an Irishman, and I have lived in Ireland during the terrible times through which we have passed. But in all the dreadful scenes I have witnessed I have, nevertheless, never despaired of the future of my country, and I do not despair of it now. I have seen its people misled and driven into evil courses by years of agitation and misrule. I have witnessed, with deep sadness, the ruin which has been spread over every class of industry in the country during that dreadful time. I believe that I now see an awakening—a great change in the country, and an earnest desire for the restoration of law and for those securities for peace and order without which no country can possibly thrive or prosper. I believe that the people are at last aware that the conflict with law and order has driven them under the thrall of a despotism more cruel and tyrannical than any under which any civilized people has ever suffered. I believe that Her Majesty may rely, at any rate, on this feeling, for the present, for the experiment of governing Ireland in future upon the same laws and provisions which suffice to secure the peace and prosperity of the rest of Her Majesty's Dominions. Sir, history shows that Irishmen, when firmly and fairly governed, are as capable of becoming good and faithful citizens as the inhabitants of any other country in Europe. But they must be fairly and firmly governed, without prejudice on the one hand, and without vacillation on the other. In the past revolutions which made their mark on English annals the loyalty of Irishmen, often to a falling cause and to their own ruin, is a matter of history; and I would ask hon. Members where would be the record of our history if the valour, bravery, loyalty, and devotion of Irish soldiers were expunged from it? Even during the late troublous times the loyalty and devotion of the Royal Irish Constabulary, a body recruited from the midst of the Irish people, has been beyond all praise. [An hon. MEMBER: Belfast!] An hon. Member says "Belfast." I will not allude to Belfast, because we have been told that a Commission with great powers is immediately to be issued, and also because I have reason to believe that the question of Belfast will be brought before the House by an Amendment to the Address. But I am glad that a searching investigation will take place, and I rejoice to hear that the Commission will have power to take evidence on oath. I will not also allude to the terrible state of the Southern counties of Ireland — such counties as Cork, Kerry, and Clare—because I believe that it has been brought about by circumstances which are only present and passing—circumstances which, I believe, a Government at once firm and willing to act would find no great difficulty in controlling. I look forward to a time, not far distant, when Ireland, under a firm and just Government, will be as prosperous and, for its own interests and welfare, as attached to the Union as any portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. Sir, in my opinion, the agrarian difficulty is at the root of the Irish Question, and that difficulty will be greatly met by an extension of peasant proprietorships. But, to attain this, confidence must be restored in Ireland, crime must be punished, and honest men must be allowed to reap the reward of their industry. The influx of capital, at present driven from Ireland by crime and violence, must be encouraged and brought back; persons must be made to feel that they are secure in the investments they make, that crime and outrage must be punished; and if coercion, so called, be required, it will not be used to coerce honest and law-abiding citizens, but to protect them from coercion bred in a foreign country, and followed up by an agitation which crushes out the life-blood of the people. The country will then become prosperous. Sir, I have dwelt thus much upon Ireland, because I believe that upon the conduct of their Irish policy depends, not only the stability of the Government, but also the welfare and almost the existence of the British Empire. I have spoken, Sir, as briefly as I could; but I have spoken in singleness of heart, with a true love of my country, and with true loyalty and devotion to the British Empire. I trust that I have spoken no word which can give offence. I thank the House for the indulgence with which it has listened to me, and I beg to move that the humble Address of which I have given Notice be presented to Her Majesty as an answer to Her Most Gracious Speech from the Throne.

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that Her Majesty has summoned us to meet at this unusual season of the year for the transaction of indispensable business:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that the Session of the last Parliament was interrupted before the ordinary work of the year had been completed, in order that the sense of Her Majesty's people might be taken on certain important proposals with regard to the Government of Ireland, and that the result of that appeal has been to confirm the conclusion to which the late Parliament had come:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the provisional nature of the arrangement which was made by the last Parliament for the public charge of the year renders it inexpedient to postpone any further the consideration of the necessary financial legislation:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the Estimates which were submitted to the last Parliament, and were only partially voted, will be laid before us:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that, at a period of the year usually assigned for the Recess, and after the prolonged and exceptional labours to which many of us have been subjected, Her Majesty abstains from recommending now, for our consideration, any Measures except those which are essential to the conduct of the Public Service during the remaining portion of the financial year:

"Humbly to assure Her Majesty that such Measures shall receive our prompt and careful attention."

MR. J. M. MACLEAN (Oldham): Sir, on rising to second the Address which has been moved by my right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel King-Harman) I feel myself placed in a condition of some embarrassment, which causes me to make a special claim upon the indulgence of the House. On similar occasions I have noticed that it is usual for hon. Members who discharge this honourable duty to speak upon almost any and every topic — they "survey mankind from China to Peru;" they discuss all manner of questions, whether relating to home, or foreign, or Imperial policy, in which Englishmen can possibly be concerned. But on this occasion my range of observation is necessarily restricted by the severely businesslike character of the Speech from the Throne. I think it would be impossible to imagine any Speech more directly to the point, or one which stated the cause for which Parliament is called together with more admirable brevity and clearness. The Government are evidently of opinion that, although technically this is the first Session of a new Parliament, yet, in reality, we have only met here to continue and complete the work begun in the Session of the short Parliament of 1885. The correctness of that view is guaranteed by the language used in the Speech from the Throne before the Dissolution of the last Parliament, because at that time Her Majesty told us that she released us from our labours before the completion of the regular work of the Session in order that the opinion of the nation might be taken on the Irish policy of the late Government. We have now come together to complete that necessary work. We all know that the financial business of the country is greatly in arrear. Votes on Account have been taken which might have enabled the Government to delay the meeting of Parliament till October; but I believe Her Majesty's Advisers have thought it more compatible with the situation, and more straightforward towards the new Parliament, to call it together at once, in order that those Votes which have been reserved for discussion, and particularly the Irish Votes, might be submitted forthwith to the House, and that Irish Members might have a Constitutional opportunity of giving their opinion on the voting of money for carrying on the government of Ireland in its present form. Sir, I feel convinced that the country is thoroughly in accord with Her Majesty's Ministers as to the propriety of the course they are now taking. To judge from the language used in the newspapers, and from the Ministerial elections which have taken place—Lord Salisbury explained, at the meeting at the Carlton Club, the reasons which induced him to call Parliament together—from all these sources we learn that the country is desirous of a period of rest. And this is only natural, because both Members and constituencies have been engaged for 12 months in incessant political agitation. We have felt the severe strain of the work, and especially those who have had to go through two contested elections; and it is natural that we should now have an interval of repose, in which to recruit our exhausted energies, to recover our tempers, to find a variety of occupations and amusements for our jaded minds and bodies, and thus to lay up for ourselves a fresh store of health and strength for the Parliamentary campaign, which will be arduous enough next year.

I have tried to think from what quarter of the House objection might be taken to the moderate programme set before us by Her Majesty's Government. I turn to the Benches occupied by the followers of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). We have heard a great deal during the last few days of the sentiments of that hon. Member and his supporters with regard to the present situation of affairs, and I see that one of the best known of his followers has spoken in a most enthusiastic way of the great moral victory which his Party has lately achieved. Sir, it is always a great consolation for men who have suffered a great material defeat to say that they have won a great moral victory; but it is satisfactory to hear from the speeches made in that quarter that the hon. Member for the City of Cork and his Friends are of opinion that, by pursuing the course of Constitutional agitation in which they are engaged, under the auspices of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), they may very soon succeed in attaining their ends. I see that one of those hon. Members believes that Home Rule will be granted to Ireland with the goodwill of the English people within the limits of one year. [*Cheers.*] Hon. Members cheer that statement. It may be right or wrong; but, if that is their opinion, it absolutely precludes them from having recourse to a policy of defiance and exasperation, and compels them to continue in accord with popular sentiment in this country, and to give such facilities as they can for the carrying on of the ordinary and indispensable business of the country in the proper way.

Now, Sir, we have not had an opportunity—we shall have the opportunity during the debate—of knowing what is the judgment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian upon the programme of the Government; but we have heard a good deal lately from the hon. Member who puts himself forward as the spokesman of the sadly diminished following of the right hon. Gentleman; we have heard from the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) much about what he thinks should be done in order to assert the vigour and policy of the Liberal Party. The scheme of that hon. Gentleman appears to be this—civilly to bow out of the Liberal Party everybody who does not agree with him. It is perfectly natural that we, on our part, should not be disposed to baulk this inclination; on the contrary, the Government would, I believe, readily grant, at ordinary times, every facility for carrying out such a design. But I will put it to the hon. Member that, in the interval of a few months, he may be enabled so to perfect his plan as to carry it out with less risk of the recurrence of that terrible miscarriage which was the result of all his diplomatic efforts to heal the breach in the Liberal Party of the last Parliament. Now I turn to the large Party of Unionist Liberals who follow the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), and remark that we know from their public utterances that they are willing to give a loyal support to the Government in carrying out the programme now put forward.

It only remains for me to say a few words as to the policy of the Conservative Party. We are asked what that policy is. It is not for me to indicate it; it would be presumptuous for me to form a forecast of the speech which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), who now occupies his rightful position as Leader of the Tory Party in this House, will no doubt make later on in this debate; but I think his speech might well be a free English rendering of that well known French phrase, *J'y suis, j'y reste.* The Government are perfectly justified in taking up that position; because what is it that the Unionist Party has lately done? Why, they have repulsed a most dangerous attack upon the citadel of the Constitution. If those who have been thus repulsed wish to renew the attack, well, then, it is for them to make the next move. We have the mandate of the country to justify us in saying that all we have to do is to maintain the Union as it now exists, and to take care that the law is strictly, consistently, and, at the same time, generously administered in all parts of the United Kingdom. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members opposite seem to doubt that we have any mandate of that kind. I say that the verdict given by the constituencies is a splendid vindication of free discussion and popular government. We can all remember the scene in this House — for on whichever side we sit, or whatever misgivings we might have had as to the tendency of his policy, we were accustomed to look to the late Prime Minister as the most illustrious of living Englishmen—when the right hon. Gentleman brought forward his great scheme of Home Rule and placed it before the House. Whether we regard the magnitude of the issue, the reputation of the principal actors in the drama, or the completeness and effectiveness of the stage accessories, I think it will be more memorable in Parliamentary annals than even that pageantry of the impeachment of Warren Hastings in Westminster Hall, which Lord Macaulay has described for us in such glowing colours. The right hon. Gentleman put forth all the energies of his mind, all the resources of his eloquence, to strike the popular imagination; and he appealed more especially to the generous emotions of Englishmen by inviting them to co-operate with him in a great work of justice and humanity. When we think of the magnetic and almost magical influence which he has in raising the enthusiasm of the people, I think we may almost be surprised that he did not carry with him the whole country. But many hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House helped us to make a splendid protest against that policy; those hon. Members did splendid work in educating the public mind; the Irish policy of the late Government was thoroughly discussed and threshed out by the people during the autumn; and the verdict of the people, which I believe to be final and irrevocable, was given. The Home Rule Bill, in my opinion, is dead; I do not think the right hon. Gentleman opposite will attempt to revive it; and if he does not, no meaner spirit is likely to step in to accomplish what he has left undone. I say that the verdict of the constituencies is a signal vindication of the policy which has been adopted by the two great political Parties in this House in the enfranchisement of householders in boroughs and counties during the last 30 years. Many hon. Members used to look with grave misgivings upon those Acts; but we know now, after the great trial to which the Democracy has been exposed, that they possess the same common sense, the same sobriety of judgment, the same patriotism, the same Imperial instinct, the same tenacity of purpose which have always been the distinguishing features in the national character of Englishmen. If I may say one word more about the policy of the Government, I will venture to refer to a statement which the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) made not long ago. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the administrative skill of that right hon. Gentleman, we all admit that he is perfectly unrivalled in the art of coining expressive phrases. I think that his alliterative jingle about "manacles," which now excites so much admiration among the most extreme section of the Irish-American Party across the Atlantic, is a phrase which the right hon. Gentleman must himself regret to have uttered, because it did the grossest injustice to the policy of his opponents. But there is another phrase uttered by him which explains the policy which Her Majesty's Government have now in view. The right hon. Gentleman said he wanted to secure power at Westminster and order in Ireland. Well, that is the aim of Her Majesty's Government also; but they do not wish to secure it by the same means; they do not wish to banish the Irish Members from this House, and thus give an outward and visible sign of the disruption of the United Kingdom. They are quite content to work on either with those hon. Gentlemen or against them, and to make the best of the government of Ireland. They mean to do this—to uphold order in that country; and to take care that the lives, the liberties, and the property of the humblest citizens in Ireland shall be safe, whether it be in Belfast or in Kerry.

Before concluding, I should like to say one word with regard to the notice which appeared in the newspapers—to that in which the hon. Member for the City of Cork invited his followers to be present here to-day, on the ground that the state of public affairs is grave and pressing. Sir, the state of public affairs is always grave and pressing in the case of an Empire which, like England, has such vast and world-wide responsibilities. Not only is the state of public affairs grave and pressing with regard to Ireland; but it is grave and pressing with regard to other matters. Ireland is, no doubt, an interesting country; but, after all, it is not the most important part of the British Empire, and the English people expect Her Majesty's Government to consider other matters, of great importance to themselves—they expect Her Majesty's Government to be able to devote some time to the urgent and pressing questions affecting the trade and commerce of this country.

Then, again, with regard to foreign policy; we know that our rivals and enemies in all parts of the world have shown great activity in recent years, and that it is absolutely necessary that the Government should keep constant watch upon them. I do not think Foreign Governments are likely to have less respect for England, when they find that the Government can devote as much attention to administration as to legislation, and that this "land of settled government" does not require to effect a change in its Constitution every six months.

Finally, there is the great question which has attracted the attention of the

English people for some time past, and which Lord Salisbury the other day handled with generous sentiment, and, at the same time, with statesmanlike discretion—I mean the question of Imperial Federation. In that question there are, I admit, difficulties which are not dreamed of in the philosophy of after-dinner speeches. Not the least of these difficulties is the consideration that, in the interest of British taxpayers, the power of the sword must never be separated from the power of the purse, and that those who wish to control the Imperial policy of this country must be prepared to bear a fair share of Imperial burdens. But these and other difficulties exist to be overcome by statesmen. For my part, I am disposed to share the hope, expressed, I believe, by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, in his great speech on the Home Rule Bill, in which he pointed to the possibility of finding the solution of our Irish difficulty in a system of federation; and I think that we might thus, perhaps, to apply the famous words of Canning—"Call in a new world to redress the balance of the old." But, be that as it may, we know that the sentiment of our race throughout the world is now strongly in favour of binding together the Mother Country and its Colonies and Dependencies in a closer and more effective union; and the achievement of such a task would indeed be an Imperial work, and one worthy to engage the attention of English public men. Sir, I have the honour to second the Motion of my right hon. and gallant Friend.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, &c."—[See *page* 96.]

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian) said: Sir, I am sure that no one will question either the right of the two hon. Members who have addressed the House to assume the duty which they have discharged, or the ability which they can bring to the discharge of any duty which they may undertake. At the same time, Sir, I cannot help saying that I am glad to say that it forms no part, according to usage or according to the convenience of the office I have now to discharge, to comment in detail upon the speeches in which the Address has been Moved and Seconded. In particular, with regard to the speech of the hon. Member the Seconder (Mr. J. M. Maclean), while I am sincerely indebted to him for the favourable and too flattering remarks with which he was pleased to refer to me personally, I own there were two points that struck me in that speech to which I should like to refer. One phrase I will observe—and which I regret he uttered—because I think it must have fallen from him inadvertently. The hon. Gentleman spoke of "our rivals and enemies in all parts of the world." Well, Sir, I confess, without wishing to take an over-sanguine view of the state and relations of civilized nations, I do cherish the hope that we have not at any rate got rivals and enemies in all parts of the world. I followed the hon. Member with great sympathy in that portion of his speech in which he referred to the labours to which we have been subjected, and the state of exhaustion to which we have been reduced. I entirely followed him in that portion of his speech; but then I must confess that I was somewhat surprised when I found that, instead of manifesting this exhaustion, and avoiding topics of controversy, and encouraging brevity of debate, the hon. Member, though he did not "survey mankind from China to Peru," nevertheless undertook, I think, the much more arduous task of stating in full, and as if by anthority, the policy of the existing Government, and undoubtedly gave to his remarks, as in a certain degree also did the Mover of the Address, a polemical and provocative character. Well, Sir, my sincere desire and intention and duty on this occasion, is to avoid all subjects that are properly speaking of a controversial character, and in that respect I have perhaps an advantage over the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I have very few remarks to make upon the Speech from the Throne. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Address (Colonel King-Harman) began by referring—in terms extremely courteous and considerate as towards the hon. Members on this side of the House—to the foreign policy of the Government. Anything that I have to say upon that subject will be disposed of in a moment or two, and I hope it will not be conceived in a different tone. With regard to Burmah, I express much regret to find circumstances reported from time to time which would appear to indicate that far greater difficulties have been experienced in connection with that country than were anticipated at the time of its annexation. But, Sir, I am well aware that the first Government of Lord Salisbury, in deciding on that act of annexation and announcing it to the world, had questions of an arduous, and difficult, and delicate character to deal with, and undoubtedly I should be very far from taking advantage of anything that has happened for the purpose of justifying an adverse verdict on their conduct until there is information before us of a nature to justify and require such a verdict. With respect to foreign policy generally, I infer from the absence of notice of it in the Speech from the Throne that there is no question at present before the Government of a grave or alarming character; for if there had been such question, no doubt they would have thought it fit and necessary to refer to it. I would go one step further, and say it was with very great satisfaction that, during the first Government of Lord Salisbury, I found myself able to follow not only with acquiescence, but in general with decided approval, the measures which that Nobleman had taken, in the Office of Foreign Secretary, for the defence of the honour and interests of this country, and for the maintenance of the peace of the world. I venture to express the hope, after the intervention of the six months during which we held Office, that the time has perhaps arrived when a great public advantage may be found to have been achieved in the attainment of something like a continuity in the foreign policy of the country, which, undoubtedly, will prove exceedingly conducive to an increase both of our legitimate influence, and to the peace and welfare of the civilized world. The reference to Ireland in the Speech is very brief, and the reference to the Elections is one of which I can make no just complaint. It is perfectly true and undeniable that the verdict of the country, as expressed in the Returns to this House, has tended "to confirm the conclusion to which the late Parliament had come" with respect to the Irish policy of Her Majesty's late Government. The hon. Gentleman obliges me to say a word upon that subject, and one word only it shall be. He expressed his opinion that even I, the ringleader in all the mischief which he thinks has been done, should never again attempt to produce the measures which were introduced on the part of the late Administration into this House. I will go so far towards meeting the hon. Member as to say that certainly, in my opinion, the conduct of the great question connected with the policy of this country towards Ireland is a matter that ought under all circumstances, where it is possible, to remain in the hands and under the primary responsibility of the Government; but if the hon. Gentleman supposes that anything that has happened has produced the slightest change in my convictions with regard to the basis and principle of that policy, I cannot afford him the slightest encouragement or smallest ground for such a supposition. I do not wish to press forward the course of events with undue haste. I hope we shall remember on this side of the House what is due to a Government which has just assumed Office; but I must say that all that has happened, instead of weakening, has confirmed me in the strong belief that we did not err in the main principles of the measures we recommended to this House. It is, perhaps, not now the time for me to anticipate the answer that may be made to the hon. Member's announcement of the irrevocable character of this verdict of the country—it is not now the time or place for me to dwell on a different anticipation; but, so far as my convictions are concerned—and I hope that my actions will ever follow my convictions—I felt it necessary to say the few words I have addressed in answer to his appeal. The retrospect of the Irish Question is, I think, stated in the Speech from the Throne with perfect fairness. I must say a few words as to its prospects; and what I am now going to say as to its prospects in the hands of the existing Government will not, I hope, transgress the line that I have laid down for myself. I do not desire, or intend, or think it to be controversial; but I am aware that it is an unhappy condition of human life occasionally to provoke by paying a compliment, and I am not certain how far the compliment I have to pay will be acceptable to those for whom it is intended. On reading this Speech—I am not referring to what it contains, but to what it does not contain—my first impression is an impression of decided satisfaction. Although we are believed to be at issue, and I fear still at issue, upon principles of some depth and breadth, yet I cannot but bear in mind the position in which we stood six months ago with regard to the principle of what I will not call "coercion," but what I may call "a repressive policy for Ireland," and the very marked difference from the position in which we now stand, and the mitigation which this change appears to me to indicate in the views, intentions, and temper of Her Majesty's Government. It will be borne in mind that, on the 26th January, it was found necessary to announce—and announce in terms of great decision—in this House the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a strong measure of a repressive class, as being absolutely required and called for by the existing condition of affairs in Ireland. Evidently that view of the state of Ireland was not abandoned by the Conservative Government on their retirement from Office, because, on the contrary, reference was made on various occasions to the condition of Ireland, as requiring immediate and strong handling on the part of the Executive. On the 4th of March last, a Motion was made by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Dublin University (Mr. Holmes), who represented Ireland in this House at the time, on the part of the Party now in Office, in which he went the extreme length—for it certainly was an extreme length—of saying—

> "That this House is unwilling to entertain Estimates for the Civil Establishments in Ireland before being placed in possession of the policy which Her Majesty's Government intend to pursue for the restoration and maintenance of social order in that country."

At that time we had been five weeks in Office; and the right hon. and learned Gentleman was prepared to go that length, although he is now one of those who are inviting us to use expedition in voting all the remaining Estimates. The right hon. and learned Gentleman at the time was prepared to refuse Supplies, because, within a period of five weeks from the assumption of Office, we had not produced our measures to the House. I dare say he will have an opportunity of explaining these matters in the course of the debate, and I do not wish to draw from him a premature explanation. But his action was not a solitary action; it was the action of his Party. The noble Lord who is now the Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill) then expressed—

> "The strong conviction he entertained of the necessity for the suppression of the National League for all the purposes of law and order."

And the right hon. Gentleman, then the Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), distinctly affirmed the Motion of the right hon. and learned Member by a short speech, which he made after the division on the Adjournment, in which he described it as a "protest against the betrayal of the country." It certainly was a strong proposition, and I only quote it to show the strength of the convictions with which it was then connected as to the necessity of repressive legislation for Ireland, that non-production of such legislation was declared by the right hon. Gentleman to be a betrayal of the country. Nor was the opinion abandoned for a considerable time after the Motion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman; for the most dismal accounts were given by noble Lords, now Members of the Cabinet. On the 2nd of June, in the House of Lords, speaking with reference to the condition of Ireland—to the condition of Ireland as it then stood—Lord Cranbrook, for example, said—

> "The people are suffering torture; they are losing property through your neglect; those tenants who are honest men are afraid to pay their rent through your neglect, and the landlords are impoverished."

And Lord Ashbourne, whom I need not quote in detail, speaks in much the same sense. Therefore, we had at that time a very strong conviction announced in this House on the 26th of January, and long afterwards consistently maintained, and strongly urged, involving the necessity of the immediate application of repressive measures to Ireland. Now, I am sorry to say that, so far as we take the test of the diminution of crime, there has been no change which warrants a different view at the present time from the view which might have been taken in January last. The latest Returns that I have is the Return for June and July of agrarian crime compared with the Return for December and January—the two months preceding the present period compared with the two months preceding the notice of a great repressive measure. In December and January, the crimes—apart from threatening letters reported to the Constabulary—were 110; in June and July they were 124; and I am sorry to say that the agrarian crime of the last 12 months in Ireland has, undoubtedly, presented a more serious character than that which had marked it during the two preceding years. It is more serious in this important respect—that, whereas in those two years the crime of agrarian murder had been almost effaced, within the last 12 months the agrarian murders amount, I think, to no less than 10. Now, Sir, do not let it be supposed for a moment that I think there is a state of things in Ireland that justifies the introduction of repressive measures. I think nothing of the kind. But what I wish to observe is this. The persons of great authority now at the head of the largest Party in this House, who felt an overwhelming necessity for repressive measures in January last, and who continued to urge for some months that such measures would be necessary, have now abandoned the opinion, and meet the House without any indication of an intention to introduce them; and, on the contrary, allowing for what the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) has said with regard to a Prorogation, after the close of the discussion on the Estimates, point to the intervention of an interval before any measures or any policy as to the state of Ireland are to be introduced. Now, Sir, in my opinion, in proportion as we move away from the state of readiness to adopt coercion in legislation, we come nearer to the essential, vital, and necessary principles of a sound policy of separate self-government for Ireland. I have therefore to express my satisfaction—not as a matter in any way of reproach—I heartily express my satisfaction that there appears to me to be a greater approach to unity on this important subject of repressive legislation for Ireland—a greater approach to the unity of principle and feeling in this House at present, than existed six months ago. And now, Sir, with respect to the Prorogation of the House, and the interval which possibly may elapse before Her Majesty's Government make their proposals with reference to Ireland. The Seconder of the Address stated indeed that they had nothing to do but to maintain the Union and administer the law. That is a very simple view of the condition of Ireland, because we have been for the last 86 years maintaining the Union, and I do not suppose there is any Party in the House—at least I do not suppose that either of the two Parties which have been connected with the administration of the law of Ireland—will for a moment allow that they have not, at all times, done their best to administer the law. I think that, in that respect, the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Address can hardly have embraced the fulness of the intentions of Her Majesty's Government. I am persuaded that, especially after what I have said with regard to their indisposition to adopt measures of coercion, measures of repression—I am persuaded that Her Majesty's Government take a very different measure of their own duty, and of the necessities of the case. That on which I am now going to offer a remark is simply the question of the time when they will be in a condition to make known to us their general view, and to lay before us such proposals as they may think it their duty to introduce. Sir, a fair time ought to be allowed; but I think the House will feel with me that that time ought not to be unnecessarily prolonged. The Opposition on that subject were, six months ago, extremely rigid. If I remember rightly, it was with the utmost impatience that I could be allowed to beg of the House a period of six weeks, during which six weeks we were in the midst of all the Business of the Session, and not with the leisure of a Recess—during which six weeks we were to undertake the formation of two Bills as complex, perhaps, as almost any Bills that have been laid before the House for a great number of years. Well, I thought we were rather severely, and I believed harshly, pressed at the time, and I do not propose to retaliate; but I do propose to say that it appears to me hardly consistent with political prudence—I do not wish to raise it as a subject of sharp difference of opinion at this time, and I certainly do not think of anything like moving an Amendment to the Address on the subject—but it does appear to me that it would not be consistent with political prudence to contemplate the adjournment of all declation of Irish policy so long as until the month of February, when Parliament usually meets. There are two considerations which seem to me to support that view of the case, independently of the fact that it can hardly be thought that so long a period is necessary for the consideration of the case, at a time when our minds have all for the last 12 months really, I might almost say, been considering little else. The first of these considerations is that this is a question not of general policy, not of mere legislative improvement, but of social order. Both sides of the House, during the last Session of Parliament, were completely agreed in that view of the case. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) urged his plea on the ground that the condition of social order in Ireland was most urgent, and required immediate attention. That we never questioned for a moment. The question was between the different modes of dealing with social order in Ireland. We proposed a mode—differently, perhaps, from the majority of the House—which we thought the only certain and effectual mode; but we never questioned that it was a matter of social order which was before us. Well, Sir, the matter of social order is from the very nature of the case a matter of urgency. I remember very well when Sir Robert Peel took Office in 1841, after the rejection of the Whig Government—and I am not sure, Sir, that we did not meet on the very same day of the month of August, 45 years ago, as that on which we are meeting now—after he obtained the residue of Supply he was allowed an interval until February to frame his measures. But his measures were not measures connected with social order. There was no question of social order at issue at all. They were measures entirely of commercial policy. The Corn Law of the year 1846 had become, perhaps, a subject of controversy which might be said indirectly, at least, to involve social order; but in 1841, and for years after, it was a pure question of legislative improvement, with regard to which there was not the smallest argument for deviating from the arrangement of the time with respect to the proceedings of Parliament. I own that it appears to me that it would be a great responsibility—especially as we have seen that whatever urgency there was in the state of Ireland six months ago has not in any manner been abated—it would be a very great responsibility to pass into the winter and through a large portion of the winter before taking this House into the confidence of Her Majesty's Government, and calling attention to this most grave and most absorbing question. There is another consideration which meets me in the same direction, and it is this—I believe, although agrarian crime has not diminished in Ireland, yet I do believe that we have in the general feeling and sentiment of Ireland at this moment a temperate disposition of the public mind, more disposed to discourage everything of the kind than probably has been the the case for many, many years past. I should be very sorry if a period so favourable were allowed to pass away. And, Sir, there is that other question to which reference has hardly been made, but which cannot be absent from the mind of anyone who touches Irish matters—namely, the question of the payment of rent. The condition of Ireland with regard to the payment of rent has, I believe, upon the whole, not been for the last 12 months in a very satisfactory condition. I speak of it as relatively to other times, and I speak of it also as relatively to the payment of rent in England and Scotland, where there has been a disposition to pay; but nobody can say on the other side that the state of circumstances has been altogether satisfactory. Well, we approach in November a great and important period for the payment of rents in Ireland. The circumstances of harvest are uncertain. Though a good crop is in the ground, the actual weather prognostications do not allow us to form the most sanguine anticipations—at any rate, the most certainly sanguine anticipations as to what may happen. We know the opinion that prevails in Ireland—that of, at all events, a large portion of the community, in consequence of the changes in agricultural values—that there is a difficulty in maintaining the judicial rents. I am not qualified to give an opinion on that subject for myself, and I give no opinion. What I wish to impress is, that we have at the present moment a season singularly favourably in Ireland for the dealing with any real political exigencies of that country, and that we should lose all our advantage were we to pass into a different state of things with regard to the payment of rents. Were there to be anything like a general resistance or any revival of the doctrines hostile to rent under the influence of the passing circumstances of the moment, an immense addition would be made to the complications of this question, and it is extremely desirable, as it appears to me, to forestal those complications. Now, Sir, I have no intention of raising any issue upon this in the form of an Amendment to the Address. I have no intention of even pressing at the present moment for a declaration from the Government. What I ask from the Government is that they will take fairly into consideration these matters, and will examine carefully the question whether the general considerations do not make it extremely desirable that before the close of the present year they should if they are able to do it, as I imagine they would be able, to place before the House their views of the policy for Ireland and the measures which they may think it proper to bring in. Sir, it appears to me to be a proposition which one may fairly argue without introducing into the debate anything of a polemical character. The issue before the House is extremely grave, and the opinion, I think, of nearly the whole House is agreed on that; and that the Irish Question, whatever view we may take of it, is the question of the hour, and we must endeavour to apply to it some satisfactory solution, or some approach to a solution, which may have the effect of improving the actual position. Independently of its vast importance from other points of view, it is of the utmost possible moment in reference to the object we all most cherish—namely, of placing this House in a position to maintain its efficiency and its dignity, and to address itself to the enormous arrears of legislative duty which the circumstances of late years, and most of all, perhaps, the circumstances of Ireland have tended to impede.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): In endeavouring to reply to the remarks which have fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and in endeavouring to lay before the House a clear and full statement of the views of Her Majesty's Government in the present conjunction of public affairs, I trust that I may receive, not in any way on my own account, but on account of the importance of the affairs with which I will try to deal, some measure of the patience and indulgence of the House of Commons. I fear it will be necessary for me to trespass, although at an inconvenient hour, for some little length of time; but it will be my object, as far as possible, to condense and to render concise the remarks which it is my duty to make. It is, at any rate, one of the most pleasant privileges of anyone filling the position which I have the honour to hold that, before addressing himself to the more difficult and less pleasant portion of his task, he may, with the general concurrence of the House, as on almost all occasions, offer to the Mover and Seconder of the Address the congratulations of the House on the manner in which they have discharged their duties; and I feel certain that on the present occasion I shall not be in any way transgressing the rights of my position in offering to my right hon. Friend and my hon. Friend, the Mover and the Seconder of the Address, the thanks of the Government, and the congratulations of, at any rate, a very large portion of the House who listened to them, on the skill, tact, and ability with which they discharged duties which are always difficult. I do not propose to follow, at any great length, the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in the remarks which fell from him, because I fancy that the general statement of the views of the Government which I shall have to make will, to a great extent, answer many of his inquiries and comments. Certainly, we have nothing whatever to complain of, and no severe comments to make on the speech which the right hon. Gentleman has delivered. It certainly was to me an enormous relief to listen to that speech, because, from sources of information which are not naturally always well-informed, we had been led to believe that an onslaught of a more than usually terrible character was to be made upon the Treasury Bench under the Leadership of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman will understand the appalling nature of that apprehension even to the stoutest mind. But that heavy cloud has passed away. In fact, there is nothing which calls for special notice in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman with the exception of two or three isolated remarks on matters omitted from the Gracious Speech from the Throne. The right hon. Gentleman alluded to the state of affairs in Burmah, and he appeared to imagine that the Government were experiencing greater difficulty in bringing that country into subjection and order than they anticipated when they assumed the responsibility of recommending its annexation. Well, I have been somewhat responsible for recommending the annexation of that country, and I can most truly state to the House that the difficulties experienced have in no degree whatever exceeded my anticipations. I never imagined that Burmah would be reduced with ease. I never expected that it would be reduced to order except after a considerable period of time. It took no less than 10 years to reduce Lower Burmah to order, though its state of civilization was more advanced; and, no doubt, though the skill of our agents is greater now than then, we must look forward to a long period before public order is established in the country recently annexed. Then as to another point, the inference which the right hon. Gentleman drew as to the omission from the Speech of any reference to foreign affairs that no grave or alarming question was now under the notice of Her Majesty's Government with regard to these matters in an absolutely correct inference. It was evident, from Lord Salisbury's remarks at the Mansion House the other night, that there is nothing in the state of foreign affairs which should seriously disquiet the minds of Her Majesty's Ministers. In the various affairs of this Empire there are always difficult and complicated questions arising out of our relations with foreign countries; but at present there is nothing, so far as I am aware, abnormal or unusual which would call upon us to depart in any way from the assurance with regard to foreign affairs which was given in the last Parliament in the last Queen's Speech. I will now proceed, if the House will allow me, to state the views of the Government on what the right hon. Gentleman called rightly and properly the question of the day—I allude to the question of Ireland. But before stating in any detail the views of the Government on that question, I may, perhaps, be permitted to remark upon the somewhat doubtful compliment which the right hon. Gentleman permitted himself to use towards the Government and Gentlemen on this side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman congratulated us on the difference of our attitude now and that held last January. He said there was a remarkable difference between the attitude we now held with regard to social order in Ireland and the attitude which the late Conservative Government took up on the 26th of January last. The right hon. Gentleman could not account for that change of attitude. He said that as far as the figures of crime go there is no reason for the change, and he could not imagine any satisfactory explanation of it. But, Sir, has there been no change in the position of the Irish Question since January last? Why the largest, widest, and most momentous change which has ever taken place has come over the Irish Question since that date. Since the 26th of January the right hon. Gentleman has taken the lead of the National Party in Ireland, and to the cause of the Repeal of the Union the right hon. Gentleman has brought over for the first time a very large majority of a great historic Party. Is that, Sir, no change? Well, how does that affect, and how does the Government consider that it affects, the state of social order in Ireland? There has been long an Organization in Ireland which aims at the Repeal of the Union, and that Organization is worked from time to time by methods which this House has regarded as treasonable and criminal. But since the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends assumed the lead of the National Party in Ireland, since they have made themselves responsible for the actions and the policy of that Party, are not the Government right in presuming, at any rate for the time, that the methods of political agitation which are familiar to the right hon. Gentleman and are regarded as Constitutional in this country may be adopted by the Party which has hitherto been slow to adopt them? I do hold that the Government are justified in assuming that the close, intimate, and indissoluble connection which now exists between the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) warrants the conclusion at which they have arrived. The right hon. Gentleman welcomed, somewhat sarcastically, what he called our readiness, for the first time, as he seemed to imagine, to depart from the constant resort to coercion. The tendency of the right hon. Gentleman to move away from the course of coercion is of very recent growth. I have never observed, nor have the Irish Members I believe observed, any reluctance on the right hon. Gentleman's part to resort to coercion. Indeed, it was admitted by them that there was a greater reluctance among the Tories to resort to coercive legislation when they were in Office than had been displayed by the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman belongs. Then, the right hon. Gentleman went on to remark as to the time when the next Session of Parliament should commence, and he was kind enough to give us the benefit of his advice on the subject, and he also contrasted the treatment he had received from the Tories when in Opposition with the treatment which he is so generously and magnanimously prepared to mete out to us. I do not wish to deprive the right hon. Gentleman of any gratification he may derive from the contemplation of his own generosity. But I cannot, nor can my Colleagues generally, quite agree with views which the right hon. Gentleman holds. There is undoubtedly much that may be said, considering the great arrears of Public Business and the many important subjects with which Parliament would be asked to deal, in favour of Parliament meeting earlier than in February next. But, after a careful review of the situation, after having convinced ourselves of the overwhelming necessity that whatever proposals the Government should make for the development of prosperity and order in Ireland should be proposals based upon immense consideration, and also bearing in mind the enormous strain to which Members of Parliament and the public generally have been put, from a political point of view, ever since the great Reform controversy, Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion, apart from the occurrence of something either in home or foreign affairs which might necessitate an earlier recourse to Parliament, that it would not be wise, nor is there anything in the state of the country which demands, that we should cause Parliament to meet before the ordinary period in February. I have only one more comment to make on the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. I cannot pass by altogether without notice the tendency of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman as to the possible non-payment of rents in Ireland. I regret he should have thought it his duty to make those remarks. I do not think that the making of them squared altogether with what appeared to be the tendency of the rest of his speech; and certainly the tendency of such remarks is extremely curious when you consider that they fell from the very author of the Land Act of 1881—an Act which the right hon. Gentleman, as the Head of the Government and his Party, solemnly guaranteed as a final settlement of the Land Question in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman now anticipates, and apparently does no vex himself with the anticipation, that the judicial rents levied under that Act may not be paid by the tenants of Ireland. Having offered that remark to the House, he states that he is not qualified to give an opinion on the subject. If that is so, it is greatly to be regretted that he should have touched on the subject at all. Why anticipate a state of things which would be most formidable, when the very anticipation from such an authority as the right hon. Gentleman might produce that very state of things which we should all so deeply deplore. And now I will ask the House to attend while I explain, as concisely as I can, the views of the Government on the Irish Question. I will deal with that question in a manner which has become by usage familiar to Members of Parliament. I will deal with it as it presents itself to the Government under the three aspects—social order, the Land Question, and local government. There is this difference, at starting, between the late Government and the present Government. The late Government were of opinion that these three questions were indissolubly connected, and their policy was to deal with them all by one measure. The present Government do not believe that the three questions are indissolubly connected, and they propose to treat them to a very large extent as totally separate and distinct. Social order we intend to treat as a question absolutely by itself. The Government are distinctly of opinion, and will not shrink from expressing it, that there is nothing in the law or in the government or in the administration of Ireland which would warrant or excuse any serious disturbance of social order. I go to the Land Question, and I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it has only recently been the subject of large legislation, and that we certainly have been led to hope that it would be a final settlement of the question. [*Cries of* "No!"] I was led to hope that by the author of that great measure. With regard to the question of local government, we wish to treat it as a question for the United Kingdom as a whole. But I come back to the first head of the subject—namely, the present state of social order in Ireland. The House might be interested in one or two figures as to crime in Ireland generally. The right hon. Gentleman himself quoted a few; but they were of a slightly misleading character. I take the total agrarian crimes for the first six months of this year, and compare them with the total for the first six months of last year, and I find, as the right hon. Gentleman pointed out, that there is an increase, not inconsiderable, of agrarian crime. The total for the six months of this year is 551, while the total for the first six months of last year was 399. But that increase is almost entirely due to one part of Ireland alone. I allude to the county of Kerry. If you subtract the figures of crime in the county of Kerry from the total amount of agrarian crime in Ireland, you will find that there has been a reduction, or, at any rate, no increase; but if I take the year 1881-2—a period when the right hon. Gentleman was in power and was at the head of affairs—if I take that period as what may be called a standard of acute disturbance of social order in Ireland, I find that, whereas the total of agrarian crimes for the first six months of this year is 551, in the first six months of 1881 it was 2,310. It is absolutely necessary for the right comprehension of the question that you should not only compare one period with another, but take great periods of disturbance and compare the present time with them. That is a general view, and although I think that many would agree—perhaps no one would disagree—that the amount of general agrarian crime in Ireland is larger considerably than it ought to be under a settled state of things, still, I do not know whether, considering all the crises that Ireland has gone through, the present amount of agrarian crime is as serious as might have been expected. But there are two parts of Ireland to which these remarks do not apply. There are two parts of Ireland which have been specially disturbed, and where the disturbance is acute. I allude, in the first place, to the greater part of Kerry, and to parts of the counties of Cork, Clare, Limerick, and Galway; and I allude, in the second place, to Belfast, which has been a scene of great disturbance. In the districts of the South and West disturbance has become not only acute, but chronic; it has even excited the strong disapproval of the Nationalist journal in that part of the world. In Belfast the disturbance has not yet become chronic, and the Government are determined that it shall not become so. There have been serious riots in that town ever since the 6th of June—riots which have excited the utmost pain and anxiety in this country—which have led, I regret to say, to a serious loss of life, no less than 25 persons having, I believe, met their death—[An Irish MEMBER: More!]—besides many women and children and innocent persons being seriously injured. They have been accompanied by a great amount of damage to private and municipal property, and they have been followed by an arrest of business and of industry from the effects of which, I fear, the town will suffer for many a long day. My right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary has informed the House that it is the intention of the Government to order a searching inquiry into the origin of these riots. [*Ironical cheers and laughter.*] I trust that the hon. Members who are indulging in those manifestations will not think that I am the least insensible to the hint they convey; but I cannot help hoping that if those manifestations are to be indulged in to any great extent they may at least be placed before the House in a definite and intelligible form, by which the opinion of the House upon those insinuations and imputations may be elicited in a distinct manner. But I turn to the question of what the Government have done for the suppression of the riots, and my right hon. Friend has instructed me to tell the House that the latest accounts from Belfast are of a very reassuring character, and that the best authorities are of opinion that the state of excitement is subsiding, and that there are prospects of a speedy restoration of order and tranquillity. The Government have not been idle even during the short time in which they have been in Office. A great number of persons have been arrested; 230 rioters have been arrested, of whom 146 have been summarily convicted, 43 sent for trial, 29 remanded, and only 18 discharged. I think that those figures will show that Her Majesty's Executive is doing its duty; but I am also authorized to add that if the number of rioters who are committed for trial should be sufficient to warrant the step, a Special Commissioner will be sent to Belfast to try them, as was done, I believe, after the great riots of 1864. But not only have the Government endeavoured to stimulate the energies of the Executive so far as the resident magisterial portion of the Executive are concerned, but the town has also been occupied by a large force of military which is in direct charge of the General Commanding the Northern District of Ireland. The military are in Belfast not for ornament or show, but for action if required. Many of the officers have been invested with special magisterial power, which would enable them to take immediate action in an emergency. There is also a very large force of police concentrated in the town, and those police will be maintained in Belfast until complete order and tranquillity are restored. Will the House permit me to make one passing observation on the Irish Police? The House is no doubt aware that accusations of a very serious kind have been very freely made from certain quarters against the Royal Irish Constabulary in relation to their conduct at Belfast. I utterly decline to discuss for one moment those accusations. There may or there may not have been individual instances of indiscipline or individual instances of reckless anticipation of orders. If those instances are proved before the proper tribunal, the individuals convicted will be punished by the proper authorities; but this I am prepared to say, that the Government will not countenance nor tolerate for one single moment any hostility, overt or concealed, against the Constabulary of Belfast. I rejoice to hear from my right hon. and gallant Friend the Mover of the Address his expressions of confidence in the Royal Irish Constabulary. We are in cordial agreement on that point with him. We are aware that the Royal Irish Constabulary have a great and glorious record of service rendered to the State during many years, and in many periods of great anxiety and public danger. The Government are sensible of the great value of that record, and they are perfectly confident that the Force, as a whole, is still animated by all the traditions of its history and origin. The Government rely on the Constabulary, and they will support that Force in the effective discharge of its most difficult and sometimes delicate duties. But if there is any portion of the inhabitants of Belfast who allow themselves to be under the impression that they can safely, or with any amount of impunity, indulge in violence or hostility against the police, those parties will make a most serious and fatal error, for which they will probably have to pay the heaviest penalties. But, speaking generally about Belfast, I believe I am expressing the sentiments of the Chief Secretary and of the entire Government, when I say that we are resolutely determined to restore and to maintain order in Belfast, and to shrink from no responsibility which will enable us to attain that end, and to attain it without delay. I now ask the House to allow me to direct its attention to the disturbed districts in the South and West of Ireland. The cause of those disturbances—which, as I have said, have become chronic and acute—is due to secret intimidation, "Boycotting," and "Moonlighting." I will give to the House the figures relating to "Boycotting" and "Moonlighting" in general. There has been a very serious increase in crime in Kerry. It has increased in the first six months of this year, as compared with the first six months of last year, from the total of 65 agrarian offences to a total of 135—more than double. "Boycotting" in Kerry and Clare, which in July, 1885, had only reached the number of 62 cases, in the present July has reached 124. "Boycotting" all over Ireland does not show the same serious augmentation. In 1886 the cases wholly or partly of "Boycotting" all over Ireland are 890, compared with 533 in 1885. But it is in Kerry where this feature of "Boycotting" outrages and "Moonlighting" shows itself in the most unpleasant form, and the House will be curious to know the number of persons who are under the special protection of the police in Kerry, as it will illustrate very forcibly the state of terror which obtains in the "Boycotted" part of Ireland. In July, 1885, there were 145 persons who required protection, and 292 policemen were employed in that duty. In July, 1886, the number was only 56, the police occupied being 107.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Have you the figures for the whole year?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I am not making comparisons between different Administrations. I am endeavouring to depict to the House the extent of crime in Kerry. To show the number of police who are taken away from their duties in order to protect people, I may mention the case of Lord Kenmare, a most amiable, estimable Irish nobleman, the respected late Colleague of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. For the protection of his person, his residence, farms, &c., 38 constables were specially employed. For the same purpose, in the case of Miss Thompson, a landowner in Kerry, 32 constables were engaged. [Mr. PARNELL: Give us the evictions.] This will show the House pretty clearly what the state of affairs is in that part of the world; and, judging from the small number of arrests that have recently been made, and the growing boldness of criminals—for instance, a few days ago, in open daylight, a police patrol was fired upon—Her Majesty's Government are unable to be absolutely certain that the Executive machinery is as sufficient as might be wished for the detection and prevention of crime in that part of the world, or altogether as adequate as the circumstances of the case require. In 1871 the right hon. Gentleman opposite had to deal with a similar state of things in the county of Westmeath, and for that purpose he proposed a secret Committee to take secret evidence, and on the Report of that Committee he suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, and the result was a very serious diminution of the crime and disorder in Westmeath. But Her Majesty's Government are anxious—in fact, are resolved—to satisfy their minds fully on the point which I previously mentioned to the House before going into extreme measures. They are going to make a very resolute effort, either by means of the agencies well within their power, to force the "Moonlighters" and criminals to desist from their lawless courses, or to take such measures as will inevitably bring them to speedy justice. With that view, Her Majesty's Government have decided to appoint a special military officer of high rank and varied experience to the command of the disturbed districts, with such powers as we believe will enable him to organize arrangements for the restoration of order and for the cessation of the reign of terror which there prevails. This general officer will be directly responsible to my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary; and the officer whom Her Majesty's Government have selected, and who has consented to undertake the duty, is Sir Redvers Buller. Speaking generally and specially, both with regard to the disturbances of social order in Ireland and in those districts I have named, and with regard to Belfast, it is the absolute determination of the Government to use to their very utmost all the existing powers of the ordinary law—to use to their very utmost all the machinery, whether magisterial, police, or military, for the purpose of restoring or maintaining order—the first duty of the Government of every civilized community. But, Sir, this I can pledge the Government to—that at the very first moment that the Government becomes conscious that they are not fulfilling that which they regard as their highest duty, and that further power and strength are necessary—at that moment they will come to Parliament and lay their case before it, and claim with all confidence from Parliament such legislation as they may deem to be necessary. I now come to the Land Question. With regard to the Land Question in Ireland, the Government are aware that various allegations are being put forward with great vigour and great assurance from many quarters as to the condition of the Irish Land Question. We are informed, or we hear it said, that judicial rents under the Land Act were fixed at a great deal too high a rate; and we also hear it alleged that the fall in the price of produce has rendered tenants unable to pay those judicial rents, even if they had not been fixed too high; and we are told that there is now, or will soon be, a general failure to pay rent in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government are by no means satisfied that there is any serious reason for any one of these allegations. Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to admit that the judicial rents fixed by the Commissioners were at any too high a rate. The Government are further of opinion that it is quite possible the fall in the prices of produce—I allude especially to the fall in the staple article of Irish produce, butter — may be due quite as much to careless or defective manufacture, or to adulteration, as to any general depreciation in prices. Then Her Majesty's Government assume, as I think they are bound to assume, that the Commissioners under the Land Act in fixing judicial rents for so long a period as 15 years left ample scope for any exceptional fall in prices. ["No!"] Well, that is the assumption of Her Majesty's Government. But, Sir, I speak with regard to the present purpose of the Government and the view they take of the present position of the Land Question, and I say that for all present purposes we take our stand on the Land Act of 1881, which was declared by its authors to be and accepted by Parliament as a final settlement of the Land Question. That Act, as supplemented by the Arrears Act of 1882 and as amended by the Land Purchase Act of 1885, Her Majesty's Government regard as a very valid and binding contract, which was made at that time between the State on the one hand and the landlords and tenants of Ireland on the other, and the policy of Her Majesty's Government will be to see that all legal obligations and all legal process arising out of that Act are strictly enforced and perfectly carried out so far as such action can come within the province of an Executive Government. If there are any persons in this House who are of opinion that there will be by the Government any interference with or suspension, by legislation or the neglect of executive action, of the right of landlords to recover their land in the event of non-payment of rent, they fall into great and serious error. We are told that if we adopt the policy of that kind there will be a general movement all over Ireland in the form of a passive resistance to the payment of rent. I take leave, in conjunction with my Colleagues, to disbelieve that statement altogether and to disregard that menace. With regard to what the farmers have acquired under the Act of 1881, they have obtained a right possessing a distinct money value, which right the Government are equally bound to regard, and we do not believe that the farmers of Ireland would consent to take part in any such scheme as threatened, or would consent to sacrifice or imperil those rights. Nor do we think that the movement in favour of non-payment of rent of 1881 has any chance, under present circumstances, of being generally repeated, in consequence of the great change which has come over the farmers of Ireland since that time. That is the statement of the policy of the Government with regard to the Land Question in Ireland at the present time. At the same time I would wish to add this further. It has been brought to the knowledge of Her Majesty's present Government that a very large number of Members of Parliament on both sides of the House and in both Houses have always entertained very serious doubts as to the economical soundness of the machinery for the valuation of rents provided by the Act of 1881. Doubts were expressed by many Members of his Party as to the economical soundness of the system of double ownership, described with matchless force of eloquence and satire by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian in 1870. Many Members of his Party, of the moderate Liberal Party, doubted this part of the Land Act of 1881. We hold that the machinery of that Act was imperfect and of a rough and ready character, and that if it did contain anything of good, whatever good it did contain was damaged, impaired, and tainted by the violence, outrage, and crime in the midst of which, and in consequence of which, it was created and brought into operation. The advocates of that Act looked upon it as being of a temporary character. The noble Lord the present Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) made a speech in Lancashire at that time in which he described the character of the machinery as most temporary, as being what he called a *modus vivendi*, and as intended to tide over the period which was to elapse, and must necessarily elapse, between the disestablishment of the system of double ownership and the establishment of a system of single ownership. Now, Sir, Her Majesty's Government are strongly of opinion — after all that has passed in connection with this Land Question and in view of the very conflicting and strong opinions freely expressed from many and various quarters—that the time has arrived when they ought to have at their command for their guidance in the future, authentic information of a distinctly official and weighty character as to the working and the present position of the Land Question in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government are aware that a great and widespread Organization has endeavoured, not without success, arbitrarily to control the working of that Act for their own ends, and they are aware that, at any rate with regard to a great part of Ireland, there does not exist at the present time perfect freedom of action in the rural community with regard to the sale or the cultivation or the hiring of land. Her Majesty's Government are, moreover, further aware that a general depression of trade and agriculture has affected England and Scotland most severely, and a great portion of the civilized world, and may be inferred to have produced some effect upon the land system of Ireland. Her Majesty's Government are also aware that many landlords in Ireland have felt it to be their duty to make large reductions to their tenants, particularly reductions of rent, which have not been hitherto made the subject of judicial arbitration; and they are aware that there is a general disposition amongst the tenantry to claim still further large reductions. I think the House will agree that these are matters which, though they are matters of imperfect information, are still matters of grave moment and concern to the Government and to Parliament; and that, as regards the future, they are matters on which authentic official information are absolutely essential to Her Majesty's Government. Sir, with that view, and at the same time asking the House, in order to avoid all misapprehension, to bear in mind the remarks which I venture to make as to the policy of the Government with regard to the right which may have been acquired and confirmed under the Act of 1881 at the present time — bearing those remarks in mind, the Government have decided to appoint a Royal Commission — [*Opposition and Home Rule laughter*] — which shall during this coming autumn and winter investigate with all care and knowledge and experience the Land Question at present obtaining in Ireland. [*Laughter from the Opposition and Home Rulers.*] I do not know why the project of the Government should excite derision either above or below the Gangway opposite; but I freely confess that there is an enormous and great advantage on the side of hon. Gentlemen opposite as compared with hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. We do not possess the enormous advantage which they possess of intuitive knowledge; and we are of opinion that with regard to so vast a question as the Land Question in Ireland all official authentic information which can be obtained is absolutely necessary before any policy can be finally determined upon. And that was the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite a few years ago when they determined to deal with the Land Question. ["No!" *from the Front Opposition Bench.*] Certainly—the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was a Member declined to deal with the Land Question in Ireland until they had appointed a Commission to furnish them with the information on the subject. I only make these remarks because I fail altogether to understand the derisive cheering of the right hon. Gentleman. The terms of reference to that Commission have been naturally to the Government a subject of the most anxious care and of the most prolonged and protracted deliberation. The names of the Commissioners we are not yet prepared to state to the House. Indeed, Sir, I will frankly state that the view of the House generally with regard to the subject-matter of inquiry will be of use to the Government before deciding on the final selection of the Commissioners. But this will be the principal anxiety of the Government, that the Commission shall be in the main an Irish Commission, and that all the chief parties and views in Ireland shall be fairly represented upon it; and I may say that any representation upon that point from any section of Irish Members will be received by Her Majesty's Government with all respect, and will receive from them full and as favourable consideration as possible. But, though we are not able to state the names of the Commissioners, perhaps the House will allow me to read to them the terms of Reference; because the terms of Reference, with the remarks which I have ventured to inflict on the House, will explain with some completeness the views of the Government on this question, and will, moreover, indicate the ultimate object of their policy on the Land Question in Ireland. The terms of Reference are these. The Commissioners will be appointed to inquire to what extent, if any, and in what parts of Ireland the operation of the Land Act of 1881 is affected either by combination to resist the enforcement of legal obligations, or by an exceptional fall in the price of produce; also to inquire to what extent there exists any general desire among tenants to avail themselves of the provisions of the Land Purchase Act of 1885, and whether the operation of that Act might be expedited and extended, especially in the congested districts, by providing security through the intervention of Local Authorities for loans advanced from public funds for the purchase of land, and to report whether any modifications of the law are necessary. I will venture to point out the leading features of that Reference. The Commissioners are directed to inquire into two specific matters in the first place. And the object of that has been to a considerable extent to narrow the range of operations, so that their proceedings may not be too dilatory and protracted. We confidently hope that the Report of this Commission may be furnished to the Government before the close of next spring. But a serious mistake will be made by any who think that the Government contemplate any further dealing with the Land Question in Ireland in the direction of any revision of the rent by the interposition of the State. That is altogether apart from the policy of the present Government. We are rather bound to the other solution of the Land Question in Ireland—single ownership—which was undoubtedly the main object of the Act of 1881. It is the main object of the Act of 1881; it is the main object of the Act of 1885, which was concurred in by all Parties in the House; and it was the main object of the Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman opposite in the last Parliament. The system of single ownership of land in Ireland, we believe, may be the ultimate solution of most of the difficulties of the Land Question; and though Her Majesty's Government will not be prepared, as far they are at present informed, to extend the liabilities of the State, as provided under the Act of 1885, they may be prepared to submit to the House proposals, if additional securities should be provided in the shape of Local Authorities. They may be prepared to submit proposals to the House for an additional outlay of public money. Well, Sir, there is one more subject on which I am anxious to speak to the House; but I fear I have already spoken at great length. There is another matter on which the Government are also resolved to acquire full and authentic information. It is a matter on which much has been said and written during many years. It is the question of the development of the material resources of Ireland. The constant allegation made by men of all Parties in Ireland has been that those resources have been neglected by the people and by the State, and that the capacity of Ireland for maintaining a much larger population even than she at present maintains is undoubted if those material resources could be developed by the infusion of capital into Ireland. On this question Her Majesty's Government propose to utilize the autumn and winter by procuring the very best authentic information. [*Opposition laughter.*] I really would appeal to hon. Members opposite to allow me to place these views before the House without more interruption than is absolutely necessary for the relief of their feelings, for the simple reason that interruption causes me to detain the House longer than I would wish. But I was saying that the Government are desirous to obtain on that subject the best authentic information at their command, and to procure it by a particular method. The Government have determined to appoint a small Commission of three Gentlemen, who, by their position and standing and experience in engineering, scientific, agricultural, and contracting circles, will be able to give, after full examination, conclusive information to the Government on that most disputed point. The exact terms of the Reference to that Commission are not yet drawn, and the Commissioners themselves are not yet selected; but the Government were anxious to place this portion of their policy without delay before Parliament, and I can state to the House the main lines of the inquiry which the Government contemplate. The Gentlemen who will form that Commission will be appointed to inquire and advise whether, by the outlay of public money, and upon what reasonable terms, the material resources of Ireland can be developed, and the energies of her people stimulated, and private enterprize attracted into that country. Our inquiries will divide themselves into three convenient and distinct channels. The Commissioners will consider the possibility of the creation of a great deep-sea fishing industry on the West Coast of Ireland by the construction of harbours of refuge, and the connection of those harbours with the main lines of rapid communication. The Government express no opinion as to the possibility of such a work. [*Home Rule laughter.*] But it is not a proposal to be derided. If such a thing were possible, and could be carried out, it would be worth a great effort and some risk on the part of Parliament; for it would undoubtedly, if successful, remove what has always been, and must always be, a source of intense anxiety to an Irish Government—namely, the extremely precarious position of the population on the West Coast, a population, I will say, than whom none is more deserving of the sympathy and support of Parliament. On this branch they would be especially directed to examine the railways, tramways, and road communication all over Ireland; and the Commissioners would be specially directed to examine the capacity and the management compared with that of other countries of the system of railways now in existence, in relation more particularly to the facilities afforded by those railways to the public generally, to private enterprize, and to private traders in particular. The third main branch of the inquiry will be the question of arterial drainage, and whether those great drainage works which prosperous agriculture would seem to require for those great river phenomena of the Shannon, the Bann, and the Barrow are not far too considerable to be attempted by the resources of single localities, and whether such large arterial drainage ought not, and could not, be remuneratively undertaken by the State for the benefit of the community at large. I now come to the third question—that of Irish government, on which I can only say that it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to devote the Recess, which we hope will be one of due length, to the careful consideration of the question of local government for all the Three Kingdoms. When Parliament re-assembles in the beginning of February next year the Government are sanguine that they will be prepared with definite proposals on that large question. Their object will be, as far as possible, to eliminate Party feelings, and to secure for the consideration of the question as large an amount of Parliamentary co-operation as can be obtained, so that, whatever settlement may be arrived at, it may not be regarded as a great political triumph of either Party, but rather in the nature of a final, durable, and lasting settlement. On this question of local government I have nothing to add. We are perfectly certain to fall into no errors on account of any hurry or undue haste. No amount of taunts, or jeers, or denunciation will make us budge one inch from our determination. At the same time, I may remind the House that it is not altogether without guidance as to the mind of the Government on this question. The Queen's Speech of January last announced the introduction of a Bill with regard to local government in England as well as in Ireland, and considerable progress had been made with the details of that scheme when the Government were roughly and incontinently ejected from Office. Speeches made at the time by those who are Ministers now would, I think, throw a good deal of light in the direction in which Her Majesty's Government will probably work. Nothing has occurred since which would lead us in any way widely to extend the limits of the policy we then laid down. On the contrary, everything that has occurred since then has tended to confirm and strengthen us in the view we then took on the subject of local government. The great sign-posts of our policy were at that time and are still equality, similarity, and, if I may use such a word, simultaneity of treatment as far as is practicable in the development of a genuinely popular system of local government in all the four countries which form the United Kingdom. That is really all I have to say to the House as to the views of the Government upon the Irish Question. I have stated, I believe, fully and frankly the main outlines of our present policy. The principal basis of that policy is undoubtedly the restoration and the maintenance of social order in Ireland, and of individual freedom to the widest extent which social order will permit. To that end we are determined, at all cost to ourselves as individuals and as a Government, to adhere, relying on the support of a great English political Party. On that foundation our policy reposes; but there is yet another, a deeper, stronger, and wider foundation—I mean the verdict of the British people as delivered with no doubtful sound at the recent General Election. The verdict of the people we take to have been clear, resonant, and unmistakably in favour of the maintenance of the Legislative Union between the two countries and of the supremacy as it exists now of the Imperial Parliament and of the full and effective sovereignty of the Queen over the whole of the United Kingdom. That verdict, for the purposes of the Government, we take to be what Lord Salisbury called it, a final and irreversible verdict, the finality and irreversibility of which cannot be in the smallest degree impugned except after another appeal to the country. On that final and irreversible verdict we, as a Government, take our stand now. Upon it we base our policy, not only for Ireland, but for the United Kingdom and the British Empire as a whole. By that policy so founded we, as a Government and as a Party in both Houses, will stand or fall.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) said, that the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if it had failed to prove anything else, had proved mainly one fact—that Her Majesty's Government, during the short time that had elapsed since their accession to Office, had not succeeded in realizing the gravity of the responsibility which rested upon them, and the many duties which inhered in them in relation to the government of Ireland. The unexcited tone of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech would, no doubt, satisfy the feelings of the average Englishman; but in Ireland the news that so many Commissions of Inquiry on so many subjects were proposed to be appointed would excite not only deep disappointment, but an emotion of actual despair. It was absolutely cruel on the part of a Minister of the Crown to rise in his place at this critical period and tell the people of Ireland that after all these years nothing could be done for them except the appointment of fresh Commissions to inquire into the condition of the country. Commissions of Inquiry had been the perpetual solace of the Irish people; but there was a general sickness and disgust in Ireland at such a policy, in the wake of which anything ameliorative had rarely followed. He repudiated the notion that the Government had nothing to do for Ireland except that advised by the hon. Member the Seconder of the Address (Mr. Maclean)—namely, to stay in Office reaping spoils whilst neglecting duties. From such a fool's paradise the Government would find themselves suddenly and energetically awakened. The policy of Ministers—the policy of procrastination, of putting off the evil hour, based as it was on the fancy belief that the result of the polls had given them warranty, would prove in its effects worse than absurd—it was self-destructive. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had tried to make out that the verdict of the people of Great Britain was complete and irrevocable against Home Rule. But a complete verdict against Home Rule would mean, as he understood it, that the great majority of the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland had declared distinctly against it. That was not the case, for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was composed four distinct States—namely, England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland; and of those four States three had declared emphatically and unmistakably in favour of granting to the people of Ireland a restitution of their right to rule themselves. Therefore he concluded that the verdict was inchoate—far from complete. England had no right of arrogating to herself the claim of over-riding the representative rights of the remaining three nationalities. As a matter of fact, it was only a small majority of the people of England who were preventing Ireland from enjoying that which they would enjoy when the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been relegated to a more obscure Bench in that House. There were rumours of Home Rule agitation in Scotland, and the wishes of the people there would not be lessened by the mode in which the aspirations of the Irish people were put on one side by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It appeared that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to put off the evil hour; but he knew quite well at the same time that it was folly to talk of Home Rule as being dead and buried, especially when Scotland and Wales and Ireland had very largely and emphatically set forth the policy of Home Rule. The right hon. and gallant Member the Mover of the Address (Colonel King-Harman) had stated that he had noticed symptoms of the Irish people beginning to tire of agitation; but anyone who knew the people of Ireland thoroughly, and who knew also the organization that had been at work to promote the cause of Home Rule, must say that the result of the late Elections had tended to intensify the energies of the Nationalists everywhere. The Irish people were never more determined and more eager in the struggle than they were now. They were not now fighting alone and without hope. The hon. Member the Seconder of the Address had stated that it would be the desire and intention of the Tory Party to propose some scheme for knitting more closely together the component parts of the British Empire; but they were neglecting the opportunity which they had in their power for uniting more closely the people of Ireland and the people of England. The federation of which the hon. Gentleman had spoken was impossible without first giving a Legislature to Ireland, and perhaps, also, to Scotland. The quietude of Ireland had been remarkable during the whole course of this agitation; but the Government must not think that this extreme quietude had been due to a growing desire on the part of the people to be temperate, or to a more satisfactory state of things between landlords and tenants. The Irish people had made great sacrifices, and had put up with even extra acts of injustice on the part of the landlords, in order that the country might remain quiet during the struggle, and so that the men who were working for their cause in that House might not be prejudiced. The farmers could not get anything for their corn, and they asked how, then, could they pay the same rents as they paid when prices were high? The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government would probably find, even before the Commissioners were appointed, that it would be necessary to take some steps to prevent the landlords from exacting impossible rents; and if that was not done, the noble Lord would not have so long a Vacation as he imagined, and when Parliament met again in February it would not be with a people ready to meet them halfway they would have to deal, but with men the fiercest passions of whose hearts would have been aroused. The noble Lord lacked all feeling of responsibility with regard to Ireland. His character was to come to the front, no matter by what means. He knew nothing about Ireland, and therefore he had no better remedy to propose than the appointment of a Commission which would suggest relief some time after the people had been evicted. He hoped the noble Lord, having recovered from the intoxication of feeling himself for the first time Chancellor of the Exchequer, would do something more than appoint a Commission. In his opinion, it was not unlikely that the Belfast riots were the result of the language of an aspirant to the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Until the Chancellor of the Exchequer went to that town all was quiet. It might be an awkward thing for the noble Lord if he went there now and was asked by the victims of the advice he had given what compensation he was prepared to give them for the losses they had sustained. One of the very first Gentlemen who ought to be called before the Commission to give evidence as to the origin of the riots was the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself; and the Commissioners who were to inquire into the origin of those riots ought to be called upon to decide whether a Minister of the Crown was not as liable, for using language inciting to riot and bloodshed, as any other citizen.

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) said, he had been in strong hopes that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have announced the determination of the Government to bring forward some strong measure of relief for the people of Ireland. Considering the present state of the farmers throughout the country, it was extraordinary that a policy of delay should have been adopted. He was afraid such a policy would result in something very serious in Ireland. The appointment of a Royal Commission had proved to be quite useless; and if they wanted really to relieve the distressed peasantry of the West of Ireland something very different should be done. Loyalty was the result of amicable relations between the governed and the governor. If the Irish people were deprived of a rule which would be at once smooth and just—if, in fact, they were not governed according to their own moral lights and aspirations, naturally a political friction, a state of disorder, would result. But for this coercion would be no remedy, because coercion would not be applied effectively until either the local government the Irish people desired had been tried and had been found to fail, or, at least, Constitutional methods had been applied to existing institutions, buttresses as they were for supporting the privileges of an aristocracy which had constantly endeavoured to outride the common sense of the country and found to be wanting. He did not approve of any appeal to sectarian spirit in Ireland, yet he recognized that this factor had a good deal to do with the difficulty of that country. He would conclude by asking the Government not to be blinded by foolish objections to Home Rule, and to cease to support the props of the minority in Ireland, in the Press, and on the platform, who had earned for themselves the epithet of disloyal.

MR. MURPHY (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I listened to the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as, I am sure, did every other hon. Member, with the greatest interest, on the occasion of his *début* to-night as Leader of the Government in this House. I also listened to the noble Lord with anxious eagerness to learn what was the policy which the Government proposed for my country. I am certainly surprised that the noble Lord has not been better able, with his great abilities, to disguise more skilfully than he has succeeded in doing the policy of Her Majesty's Government in regard to Ireland. That policy I take to be simply to do nothing whatever, but to avoid the Irish Question, and, in the meantime, to enjoy the sweets of Office. That seems to me to be a fair representation of the noble Lord's speech from beginning to end, and to be the first and last object of Her Majesty's Government. The whole burden of the speech of the noble Lord was the institution of a succession of Commissions of Inquiry. The noble Lord has promised to consider and inquire into everything. The noble Lord's Government with regard to Ireland may be fittingly described as a Government of Consideration and Inquiry. We have already had Commissions of Inquiry without end into all the subjects into which the noble Lord proposes to inquire in the coming winter, and what has been the outcome of them? We have had occasionally, in times of depression and distress, employment doled out through the Board of Works to a starving population, and a number of useless officials have been appointed to superintend them. The noble Lord desires to dangle bribes before the people of Ireland, and these Royal Commissions, of which the people have already had more than enough. Such a proposal is one which neither does credit to the noble Lord nor to his Government. The Government in Ireland in former days bribed the Legal and other Professions to a very considerable extent. Even the middle classes were bribed by honours and privileges; and now, by a large expenditure upon useless works, it is proposed to bribe the working classes. I do not think that anybody in Ireland is likely to be deceived or taken in by such a proposition as that. The question of the hour in Ireland is the question of land evictions, and the noble Lord almost gave that question a complete go-by in his speech. He stated that it was not proposed to consider the question of rent in Ireland at present, but that it might be desirable to consider the Purchase Clauses of the Land Act at some future day. We all consider that that is a desirable thing to do; but we cannot forget that while the noble Lord is now in favour of lending English money for the purchase of Irish land upon security, by no means as good as that which was offered when the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition was before the House, there has been no one who has denounced more strongly the policy of pledging

British credit for the purchase of Irish land. The noble Lord now proposes that there should be an extension of the Purchase Clauses of the Land Act, and that facilities for the purchase of land should be given on the security of certain local rates. The Irish people, through their Representatives here, were willing in the last Parliament, in connection with the Prime Minister's Bill, to give the credit of the whole country—a pledge which they would willingly and cheerfully have kept—for the purchase of the Irish land. But the noble Lord and his Party, and the Irish landlords, got their last chance; they refused to take it, and the opportunity has now passed of ever getting a similar pledge from Ireland. Never again will the Irish Representatives agree that the rates of Ireland should be pledged to help the landlords out of their difficulties. I have said that this question of evictions in Ireland is the question of the hour. There are Gentlemen with extreme Radical views, such as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), who gave so much aid to the noble Lord's Party in bringing them into power, who proposed in the last Parliament the introduction of a Bill to restrain evictions in Ireland. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman in particular will impress upon the Government, with whom he must naturally possess so much influence, the necessity of carrying out now the view which he expressed then. To my knowledge, in the South of Ireland evictions are being spread broadcast over the land. In one instance, within my own knowledge, in a certain Poor Law Board, of which I happened to be an *ex officio* member, a resolution was proposed by the Chairman of the Union, who belonged to the landlord party, which was in a majority on the Board, which prevented the Relieving Officer from reporting to the Poor Law Board any notices of eviction which might be served. I think that shows the way in which these evictions are likely to be scattered broadcast throughout the land. The time, however, has passed by when the people of Ireland are likely to sit still under a system of wholesale evictions, and allow themselves to be driven into the workhouses and the emigrant ships, as in former times. I am satisfied that if steps are not taken immediately to stay this iniquitous process of eviction the ultimate result must be coercive measures. I trust that the noble Lord and Her Majesty's Government will not allow any time to be wasted before they take this question of rents and evictions into their serious consideration, together with the question of the sale of the tenants' interest for arrears of rent for nominal sums. The decision of such questions ought at once to be taken from the landlords and placed in the hands of gentlemen who are capable of dealing with them impartially. The people of Ireland now know something of their power, and it is most undesirable that any hesitation on the part of Her Majesty's Government should lead to further agitation, trouble, and turmoil in that country. The noble Lord, in his remarks with regard to what the Government proposed to do in reference to the future of local government in Ireland, said, that during the autumn and winter there will be inquiries into that subject also. It is apparent, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government are not likely to err through undue haste. He also expressed his opinion that when this great measure of local government which is to be introduced has been passed, as he expects it will be, by a large majority of the House, if not almost unanimously, there will be a final and lasting settlement of the Irish National difficulty. Now, I want to know if the noble Lord had any *arrière pensée* when he made that remark? He knows very well that no mere appointment of Vestries or County Boards, or such measures as seem to be contemplated by himself and his Party, are likely to be final or lasting. The Irish Party, in the last few months, have gained an immense amount of strength to the national cause, and they are not likely to entertain anything but the highest hopes from the future. I would, therefore, tell the noble Lord that he makes the greatest possible mistake if he thinks that any settlement of the Irish Question likely to be of a lasting character will be obtained by any measure one whit below that which was offered to the last Parliament by the late Prime Minister. Though I sat in the last Parliament, this is the first occasion on which I have addressed the House; and with these few remarks I beg to thank the House for the patience and attention with which they have listened to me.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin County, S.): It appears to me that there can be no question as to the character of the commission with which the Irish Members have been entrusted by their constituents, and the nature of the mandate which they are asked to lay before Parliament. We have been returned to this Parliament for the purpose of asking for the restoration of our nationality. That is the main principle for which we contend, and the main object with which we have been sent here. Nevertheless, although that fact is well known to Her Majesty's Government, in the Speech of Her Majesty, which has been read to the House to-day, I have not been able to discover any declaration of the intentions of the Government in regard to the Irish National Question. I therefore think I am justified in asking for an express intimation from the Government as to what their intentions are, especially in regard to one pressing question—namely, that of evictions. There can be no doubt that in a great many cases the present rents imposed in Ireland cannot be realized. The judicial rents were, for the most part, fixed at a time when the prices of produce were much higher than they are at present, and when the seasons also had been much more favourable to the tenant farmer. This year, although the crops have been better than in former years, there is considerable apprehension that it will be impossible to save them properly; and, if that be so, the farmers will be unable to realize a profit from the land, and will undoubtedly be unable to pay the rents which have been judicially fixed. The consequence will be that in many instances steps will be taken by the landlords to carry out evictions; and unless steps can be taken to stay evictions in the coming winter the Government must be responsible for any disturbances that may take place. There is another matter which I desire to bring under the notice of the House, and that is the extraordinary change which has taken place in the sentiments of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Address (Colonel King-Harman) in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Not many years ago the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was quite as advanced a Nationalist as any hon. Member who sits below the Gangway on this side of the House; and if the House will permit me I should like to read an extract from a speech which he made some years ago—I believe in 1877—in seconding a Motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the question of Home Rule and the establishment of an Irish Parliament. In the course of that speech the right hon. and gallant Gentleman said—

> "The affairs of one parish in this country were not determined by the majority in another parish, nor those of one county by the majority in another county; and, therefore, he could not understand why Irish affairs should be determined by the majority in a Parliament sitting in London. . . . . He was quite aware that there were numbers of men in Ireland who confounded Home Rule with separation from England, but he kept the two subjects apart in his mind; and he reminded those who mixed them up together that the first body of men who spoke up for Home Rule were principally Protestant Conservative gentlemen. . . . . There were many Irishmen of considerable intelligence and influence who would limit their demand by saying—'Give us a local Commission for Ireland who can legislate for us on such subjects as Railway and Gas Bills.' But he did not acquiesce in that limitation—far from it. If, however, the Committee, after a full and fair investigation of the subject, decided that Home Rule to that extent only should be granted, he asked that that might be granted first, and then they could discuss the other points afterwards."—(3 *Hansard*, [233] 1751-2.)

It appears that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has very much changed his opinions since then, and it speaks well for the sincerity of his conversion that he is able now to move an Address in reply to the Queen's Speech which utterly ignores the important questions which are now so greatly exercising the public mind in Ireland. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman, in the course of his speech which he delivered in opening this debate, told us, among other things, that Ireland requires rest. He said that if Ireland were given rest from agitation everything would come right, and all the grievances of the Irish people would dwindle away. There can be no doubt that Ireland requires rest and quiet; it cannot be denied that the agitation which has been carried on for so many years has been a serious strain upon the resources of the country; but I can assure the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Irish people, although they are anxious for peace and rest, will never accept less than peace with honour. They were perfectly prepared to accept the measure which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for

Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) lately introduced, and would have accepted it as a final settlement; but, owing to the action of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House, that measure was defeated, and those who were anxious that the people of England and Ireland should join together in a better union—a real union of friendship and interests, and not a union made effective by brute force only—were disappointed. But, on the other hand, we may derive consolation by recollecting that no great Constitutional change was ever brought about without some preliminary reverses. If the measure of the right hon. Gentleman has proved a failure, we are consoled by feeling that it is only the beginning of the fight; and, although we have been told by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Maclean), who seconded the Address, that we have received a material defeat, we do not believe that we have received any material defeat at all. On the contrary, we believe that the introduction of the Home Rule Bill is simply the beginning of the real ending, in a satisfactory manner, of the question we have assembled in this Parliament to consider. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Address evidently fears very much that the agitation in Ireland will continue. He is perfectly right in that opinion. So long as the Irish people have grievances, so long will they agitate; and if hon. Gentlemen opposite are anxious to spare Ireland and the Empire the evils which follow from continued agitation, they will concede to the Irish people those Constitutional rights of which they are now bereft. I think it is much to be regretted that Her Majesty's Government have not given us some more explicit indication of their policy with regard to Ireland. They have promised a number of Commissions, which may probably be appointed at some indefinite period. These Commissions are to inquire into the state of Ireland, into the Land Question, and various other matters. We wish to know when they are to be appointed, how they are to be appointed, of whom they are to be composed, and what the exact course is that is to be taken? But we are left in entire ignorance; and I would venture to express a hope that before long Her Majesty's Government will take some more decided action and take the House more completely into their confidence.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I feel that hon. Members who sit on this side of the House are bound to express some surprise at the silence which has been maintained throughout the debate upon the opposite Benches. I believe I am justified in speaking for many Members who sit on this side of the House when I say that we do not intend the debate to collapse for want of speakers, and do not intend to allow the Irish Question to fall into the abeyance into which the Party opposite seem desirous of putting it. There are many interesting speakers on the other side of the House whom we are anxious to hear. There is one right hon. Gentleman whom for the last half-hour we have been expecting to rise—I allude to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for East Birmingham (Mr. Matthews). The record of that right hon. and learned Gentleman is a singular one, and is likely to attract the attention of both sides of the House. We are anxious, for instance, to hear him explain when it was that he ceased to be a Home Ruler. He was a candidate for the borough of Dungarvan in 1874, and the principal pledge which he gave on that occasion was that he would support in full the programme of the Home Rule League. Not only did he promise to support that programme, and to satisfy the national sentiment, but a few days after he joined the League he gave a generous subscription of £30 towards its funds. I should like to know when the right hon. and learned Gentleman changed his opinions, or whether he has changed them at all, and if he has ceased to be a Home Ruler? Perhaps the action of the right hon. and learned Gentleman may form part of the policy of surprise which Her Majesty's Ministers may have in store for us. Perhaps the appearance of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary on the Treasury Bench may be taken as an indication that what Her Majesty's Ministers say in their speeches is not meant to be what the public understand it to be, and that there may be an attempt to bring about a complete change of front on the Home Rule Question. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who proposed the Address said one thing in which I entirely agree, although I do not usually agree with him in anything. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman said that the Irish people wanted to be governed "firmly and fairly." I quite agree in that; but I will ask what signs are there that we are about to obtain for Ireland a firm and fair Government? Let me take the action of the Government in the steps which have been taken for the suppression of the Belfast riots. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary found, when he came into Office, a Proclamation, the object of which was to prevent the possession and use of firearms in the town of Belfast. I would ask what steps the Representatives of this firm and fair government have taken to put that Proclamation into force? Has there been one single search for arms; has one single man been arrested for the possession of arms; or is one single man to be prosecuted for the possession of arms? As a matter of fact, there has been complete inaction in this respect on the part of Her Majesty's Government. Is this total neglect to carry out the Viceregal Proclamation a sign of firmness? If it is, firmness is a very different thing from what we ordinarily understand by the word, and I very much doubt the capacity of right hon. Gentlemen opposite to be firm in anything whatever. Another sign of firmness, I suppose, is the total indifference the Government have displayed in reference to the language employed by leading Orangemen in Ireland on the subject of the Belfast riots and the action of the authorities. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. Johnston) laughs at that expression; but although he may not have spoken in violent language of the action of the Irish Constabulary, he knows that some of his constituents in Ulster have freely applied to the representatives of law and order the term "Morley's murderers." The hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. De Cobain) declared in a public letter that they were a set of Invincibles, and even worse than Invincibles, employed to carry out the work of assassination. I should have expected that Her Majesty's Government, whose duty it is to support the Royal Irish Constabulary, would have taken some notice of these expressions, and that, at the very least, they would have undertaken the prosecution of the hon. Member for East Belfast. I do not, however, believe that they will do anything of the sort. They are too deeply involved themselves. Another sign of firmness and fairness is to be found, I suppose, in the reception by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary of the Mayor of Belfast. If there is one man in Belfast who, beyond all others, except the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is responsible for the bloodshed, murder, and pillage which have taken place in Belfast it is the Mayor of that city. It was his bolts, nuts, and rivets that were flung at the police; it was his foreman who supplied the weapons of war; it was his establishment which contributed every day during the existence of the riots the greatest number of rioters. Yet this man was received at Dublin Castle, and consulted as to the best means of suppressing the riots. If the right hon. Gentleman had the courage of his convictions, —perhaps he has none—or, at least, the courage of his language in this House, instead of sending for the Mayor of Belfast to consult as to the best means of suppressing the riots in Belfast, he would have initiated his accession to Office by depriving that gentleman of the Commission of the Peace; and by that means he might have convinced all who were responsible for the murder, and bloodshed, and pillage which have taken place, that they would no longer be allowed to administer justice in that community. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who moved the Address spoke of a policy of fairness as well as a policy of firmness. Are we to look for a policy of fairness in an incident which occurred almost immediately after the Government came into power? A trial took place four or five days after the accession of the right hon. Gentleman opposite to the Office of Chief Secretary, and after the accession of the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Holmes) to the Office of Attorney General for Ireland. A man was charged with firing at the police with intent to kill. Persons who witnessed the firing gave evidence of certain acts which, according to the law laid down by the Judge, constituted a felony. The evidence was perfectly satisfactory to the mind of the Judge; nevertheless, the man who was charged with committing the offence was not convicted, but allowed to escape scot free. The gentleman who acted as chief town prosecutor, although he is usually glib and brutal enough of tongue, in this particular instance allowed the opportunity to escape, and refrained from delivering a single opening sentence in explanation of the charge. Then, again, the persons who were entrusted with the constitution of the jury allowed the jury to be packed with Orangemen. There were placed upon it 11 Protestants and Orange Catholics. If this is an example of the fairness with which the law is to be administered in Ireland, all I can say is that the meaning attached by the Government to the word "fairness" is very different from that ordinarily intended. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer has announced to-night a policy of Royal Commissions. There is to be a Commission on the Land Question, a Commission on Trade and Industry, a Military Commission, and some others. I only wonder that he did not announce a Commission on the weather, or on the effects of the Atlantic currents on the Coast of Ireland. All I can say as to these Royal Commissions is that the proposal is calculated to insult and exasperate the feeling of the Irish people. We are sick of the policy of Commissions. There is not a single Irish question, from great national questions down to the smallest question, which has not been discussed by Royal Commissions *ad nauseam*, and yet those inquiries have had no practical result whatever. What was the case with regard to the Land Question? Forty years ago the Devon Commission inquired into the state of that question; but it remained unsettled, and 30 years elapsed before any steps were taken to improve the condition of the tenantry of Ireland, though that condition was declared by the Devon Commission to be a scandal to the civilized world. I think that there was one part of the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer which will astonish some of the people of Belfast. The noble Lord announced the determination of the Government to put down rioting in Belfast, by whomsoever committed. The Orangemen of Belfast may well upbraid the noble Lord for that determination, for he himself is the really guilty party in the matter. The noble Lord told the Orangemen of Belfast that they had privileges worth fighting for. He told them to "charge with all their chivalry." He told them to fight, and they would be right; and, no doubt, when the Ulster Orangemen went out to sack a public-house, they thought they were carrying out the mandate of the noble Lord, and charging with all their chivalry. "Charge, Ulster, charge; charge with all your chivalry," was the command of the noble Lord. The Ulster men have carried out that command; and now the noble Lord, instead of commending their action, has actually the ingratitude, in reference to what has occurred in Belfast during the last two months, to threaten them with the consequences. I sincerely hope that some effort will be made to produce the noble Lord before the Belfast Royal Commission, and make him explain his conduct six months ago, when he went down to Belfast and incited the Orangemen there to engage in the riots that have lately taken place, so that it may be thoroughly known that no man, even if he be a Minister of the Crown, may in future endeavour to accomplish political objects by inciting others to commit crime. We have heard to-night something about the rents in Ireland, and the noble Lord made an astonishing assertion that there was nothing whatever in what we have heard about the fall in the price of produce, and that all rents will be paid if the landlords are afforded adequate means for their collection. I do not think the noble Lord can have read the evidence which has been given upon this subject; and I should like to refresh the memories of hon. Members by recalling to their recollection the testimony given by a very high authority only a few months ago. I mean Sir James Caird. *The Times*, anxious to back Sir James Caird up, described him as a man whose authority upon agricultural questions was universally recognized. In his letter to *The Times*, dated March 20, 1886, Sir James Caird says—

> "The land in Ireland is held by two distinct classes of tenants—the small farmers, who pay rent from £1 to £20; and the comparatively large farmers, who pay rent from £20 upwards. Of the first class there are 538,000 holdings, averaging £6 each; of the second class, 121,000 holdings, averaging £56 each. The rent payable by the first class is £3,572,000; and by the second class, £6,845,000. Five-

sixths of the Irish tenants thus pay about one-third of the total rental, and one-sixth pay nearly two-thirds. If the present price of agricultural produce continue, I should fear that, from the land held by the large body of poor farmers in Ireland, any economical rent has for the present disappeared."

So said Sir James Caird, whom *The Times* acknowledges to be a very high authority on agricultural questions, and whom *The Times* backed up by saying—

> "It is not too much to say that the rental of the 538,000 holdings is practically irrecoverable by anybody, whether landlord, English Government, or Irish Government."

We do not go so far as this; but if Sir James Caird's assertion were of any value some months ago, it ought not to be utterly discredited now. Sir, the tenants of Ireland are anxious to pay their rents, no matter what may be stated to the contrary. They know that unless they do so notices of eviction will be the result, and that they will be forced to quit the holdings which they love, and be deprived of the homes which they have inherited for generations from their forefathers. There is no other industry they can pursue than the industry they are now following. It is impossible, however, to get blood out of a stone, and you cannot exact from tenants what they are unable to pay. Therefore, no matter what means the Government take to exact these rents, failure will be the result, and you will only create the same state of things which prevailed in 1881 and 1882, when turbulence, disorder, and crime reigned throughout the country, and was made the pretext for the passing of a stringent Coercion Act. Probably this is the end at which the Government are now aiming. If it is, they may possibly succeed in their object; but they will not succeed in bringing the question any nearer to a solution, nor in making British rule better liked by the Irish people. By the time they have done they will find that they have made the situation much worse, and they will eventually feel themselves compelled to return to a policy of coercion, which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition so strongly denounced. The House has been told that the decision of the country on Irish matters is final. I certainly fail to see where the finality is. We have often heard it said with regard to other Irish questions that the end of the Irish movement has been reached. We have been told on every occasion on which we sought to remedy the grievances of Ireland that the country had decided against us, and that this House had decided against us; but we have lived to see this House reverse its own decrees and become converted to the views of the minority. Having some personal experience in the matter, and participated to some extent in the contests which recently took place in the South of England, I have no hesitation in declaring that I do not believe one single word of this declaration about finality. We have had in favour of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) the support of nearly 2,500,000 of the electors of the United Kingdom; while hon. Members opposite, with their finality, have only had the support of 280,000 more. If only 80,000 Liberals had voted against the Tory Party, and had not deserted their own colours by assisting to return Tories to this House, it is we who would have been entitled to say that the decision of the country, taken finally and irrevocably, was in favour of self-government for Ireland. [*A laugh.*] I see that an hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House laughs at that statement; but I believe that he is one of those who have been entitled to take their seats in this House by virtue of the help which they received from the Liberal Party. I firmly believe that the electors of the country voted in ignorance of the true state of the case. I never went anywhere without seeing the most enormous lies put forth everywhere; published in placards and in newspapers, and shouted from platforms, not only by speakers of the Orange stamp, but by the candidates themselves. On the other side, in too many instances, not one word was spoken or written to explain the true nature of the Irish Question. The Irish Question has been grossly misrepresented. I believe that as soon as the true state of the case is explained and the truth is made apparent to the minds of the English people we may look with confidence to the early triumph of our cause. In the meantime we are prepared to struggle on to the end, working sincerely and heartily for the establishment of a National Parliament in our country. All I can say to hon. Members opposite is this—that, so far as the Irish National movement is concerned, we are determined to extend our movement to England, in order to instruct the English people and tell them the truth, which has hitherto been obscured from their vision by lies and misrepresentation. I have listened with attention to the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but I have been unable to discover in it any germ of a policy which honest men can support. The sole object of the Government seems to be to stick to their places and enjoy their salaries. They hope to be able to do that the more readily by placing the Irish Question in the hands of Royal Commissioners. I presume they will take as long a time as possible before they appoint these Commissions; and if only six months elapse thousands of pounds will have been pocketed by Tory placemen, and large additions will have been made to the pensions on the Civil List. Probably, after their long servitude in the shades of Opposition, we ought not to grudge them a short period of power and enjoyment; but their reign will come to an end, and that sooner, perhaps, than they expect.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): Sir, it is the characteristic of Queen's Speeches in general that neither in form nor in substance are they productions at all worthy of the lofty source from which they purport to emanate; and I think that on the present occasion the Queen's Speech to which we have listened has not proved an exception to the general rule. I do not think that it is a circumstance altogether to be wondered at. Queen's Speeches have reference rather to the pledges of the past than to the promises of the future. They are given to the world at a period when the policy of the Government to which they belong is in a condition of incubation rather than of maturity; and it is not to be expected that any Government would put forward at such a time a policy yet in an inchoate state, and allow it to appear with any distinctness or detail. The circumstances in which the Government which has just been returned at the polling booths came into Office are circumstances of exceptional difficulty, and make the condition of things to which I have just referred, in regard to the Queen's Speech, far from unnatural. We have reason to believe —indeed, we have heard it from the noble Lord the Leader of this House— that the Government have to grapple with no difficulty of any great magnitude excepting that which faces them in Ireland. Certainly, that is a difficulty before which the courage of any man might well pale. It is a difficulty which is said by some of the political opponents of the Party to which I belong to be a difficulty of our creation. I believe that it is a difficulty of our creation. I glory in the fact. I believe that the policy initiated by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) is a policy which has brought about a complete change in the spirit of our treatment of Irish questions. I do not glory in that fact because it has produced embarrassment to hon. Gentlemen opposite; but I glory in it because it has, once for all, put an end to that policy of dawdle—that policy of do-nothing—which has hitherto characterized our treatment of Irish questions during the present century. At last we have come to a point at which it is absolutely necessary to take a stand. The policy inaugurated by the right hon. Gentleman may have been a bad one—I say nothing at all about that—but at all events it was a policy. The country has rejected it. However sorry we may be on some grounds that it has been rejected, there are circumstances connected with the matter for which, on other grounds, we have no cause to be sorry; and we should not be true to our trust if we did not rejoice that the people have had an opportunity of expressing, in a Constitutional manner, their opinion on the policy submitted to them. Now, Sir, I do not believe that that opinion has been finally expressed. I venture humbly to differ from the Prime Minister and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to think that the verdict of the country has been given in a partial manner only, and has reference merely to the particular policy then before the country. I doubt very much whether the country, or even those voters who recorded their votes at the last Election, had distinctly made up their minds against the principle of a Home Rule policy. Probably, if ever a policy of Home Rule is again brought forward in this House—and I believe that it will be before very long—it will assume a form differing somewhat from that in which it was submitted by the late Government; but it will embody and adhere to the principle of a separate Parliament for Ireland. It may be that in the particular form of the provisions of the Act which is to create that separate Parliament, taught by experience, something may be devised for the better conciliation of the prejudices of the English people. In the meantime, we have to face the fact that such a policy is not the policy of Her Majesty's Government now. That line of thought is one which the country has ordered us no longer to seek to pursue; and those of us who are in Opposition—at any rate, a large section of those who sit around me—who think with myself will, I am sure, seek as far as we can, consistently with our opinions, conscientiously to support Her Majesty's Government—a Government chosen by the country to carry on the important business of directing the affairs of the country. I have stated that the Queen's Speech does not tell us much about the Irish Question; but we have had an amplification of the statement contained in the Speech from the lips of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The noble Lord certainly did not tell us very much. In a number of important particulars the only proposal of the Government seems to be a desire to devolve the responsibilities of Her Majesty's Government upon a series of Royal Commissions. It does not even appear that we have heard the last of these Royal Commissions. There may be more of them. It is quite reasonable that Her Majesty's Ministers should take time to consider the policy they ought to adopt, and undoubtedly it may be that the plan of inquiry which has been foreshadowed is a plan which would not only give Ministers time, but give them access to sources of information which they would not otherwise possess. That may be the case; but, undoubtedly, these references to the policy of the future point to a course very different from any scheme which might be laid down now for the settlement of the Irish Question on the lines of the Bill which was before the country at the last Election. There can be no doubt that the mandate given to the Liberal Party in December last has been withdrawn; but on what lines are the present Government to pursue the policy which has been vaguely indicated to-night? There are several difficulties in their way. There was very little that was definite given by way of instruction to their followers during the Election, and probably their followers will find that they have committed themselves to all sorts of inconvenient pledges. Within the limits of the noble Lord's speech three provisions have been foreshadowed. The Government propose to deal with the question of social order in Ireland, with the question of land, and with the question of local government. Now, taking these as their standpoint, it is perfectly plain that by local government, having regard to the pledges which the noble Lord has allowed his followers to give, it is impossible that he can mean anything more than a policy of parochialism. It is impossible that he can mean to give any large measure of control of affairs purely Irish to Irish hands. If the noble Lord meant to do that he would find himself fettered and hampered by the pledges which he has allowed his followers to give. Then there is the question of the land. How is the Land Question to be dealt with on anything like a large scale? I venture to say that two-thirds of the hon. Members who sit opposite to me have given pledges to their constituents which preclude them from consenting to any of the public funds being invested on the security of Irish land. Nevertheless, I gathered from the speech of the noble Lord that it is contemplated, at some future day, that the Imperial Exchequer shall make large advances on the security of the Irish land. Then, as to the third question—namely, that of social order – it is evident that Her Majesty's Ministers mean to separate it from the two other questions. The noble Lord spoke of social order as if it could be disassociated from the question of local government. But it was a cardinal principle in the treatment of the Irish problem by the late Government that the question of social order was so inextricably bound up with the other two questions that it was only upon the principle of dealing with the three together that they could effectually grapple with the question of social order, and get fairly at its root. It may be that the late Government were wrong; but at all events the noble Lord, in proposing to separate the question of social order from the other two questions of the land and of local government, gives a distinct negative to the policy of the late Government. Allow me to glance at the question of local government. It is all very well to talk of local government; but if hon. Members will go to the South of Ireland, and especially to the county of Kerry, they will find that the discontented peasantry are making use of those weapons of local government which they have already in their hands for the purpose of embarrassing the classes which are obnoxious to them. They are making use of those weapons to punish landlords on the one hand, and to assist evicted tenants on the other. If, with the limited powers of local government they now possess, they can do that, what will they do if you put in their hands the more extended powers which the noble Lord states will, in the course of a few months, be given to them? As regards the question of the restoration of social order, the noble Lord proposes not to go to the root of the matter, and to treat the question as a political and an agrarian one, but to deal with it as one of police; and he seems to have persuaded a gallant officer, well known to the public, to undertake the post of Chief Inspector of Local Constabulary in the county of Kerry. When Sir Redvers Buller gets there, is it intended that he shall institute martial law? If he is not going to do that, what is he to do? Her Majesty's Government may say that they are sending him there for the purpose of inquiry; but what about the state of social order in the coming winter; what about the condition of those unfortunate landlords who will have to bear the brunt of the inaction of the Government? Whatever may have been the demerits of our policy, it was one which sought to give the landlords the power of getting themselves bought out. But the policy of the noble Lord proposes nothing of the sort, at least for some time to come. I venture to think, Sir, that in the present state of the public mind, and in the condition in which it was at the last Election, those electors who cast their votes in the Conservative interest would have been willing to strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister had he courageously announced that he proposed to carry into effect the intention shadowed forth in his Opera House speech, but afterwards explained away in the House of Lords. You may explain away the existing state of things as much as you like; but if you are to undertake a policy of repression you may depend upon it that you will require all those powers of coercion which were alluded to by implication in the speech of the Prime Minister in the Opera House. I believe that if the Conservative Party had had the courage of their convictions at the last Election they could have secured a majority in this House. As it is, they are fettered by the pledges they were induced to give, and by the declarations which they have made against coercion, and by the refusal on the part of hon. Members who sit on these Benches to allow the public money to be spent in buying out the landlords. In consequence of the course they were induced to take then they now find themselves placed in a position which must in future prove a position of great difficulty. No doubt, it is a characteristic of the Conservative Party that they always hold more together, and are more obedient to their Leaders, than the rank and file of the Party to which I have the honour to belong; and it may be that in the course of time the policy denounced upon the hustings will be acknowledged as the necessary and only policy of the Conservative Party. It may be that the Royal Commissions may report in favour of the absolute necessity of a system of land purchase, and also of some system which could only be described as one of coercion; and no doubt, if they did so, it might be found possible for Her Majesty's Government to secure a large amount of support to that policy. For my own part, I cannot altogether regret that the Liberal Party are now out of power, and compelled to fill the office of critics. That is a duty which becomes the duty of every patriotic Opposition. At the same time, it is likewise our duty to give what support we can, consistently with our opinions, to Her Majesty's Ministers in carrying on the Government of the country. There were signs before the last General Election that the confidence of the country was being withdrawn from the Liberal Party; and I do not think that its defeat at the last General Election was entirely due to the Home Rule policy. There were signs that the confidence of the country was being withdrawn from us just as it was withdrawn from us in 1874, and as it was withdrawn from the Conservatives in 1880. It has always been found that after a certain period of the enjoyment of power a political Party loses popularity. That popularity is gradually on the wane until it culminates in defeat; and it was due to causes such as this that we have now lost those East End of London constituencies, which appear to be adapted, by their indifferent and easily influenced tendencies, for recognition as a kind of political barometer. Until we have regained the support of such people I, for my part, do not desire to see the Liberal Party again in power; but when they do come back, I hope they will come back with sufficient strength once for all to settle the Home Rule Question on the lines indicated in the recent proposals. I believe that we shall come back before very long, and when it will have been abundantly proved that the policy of those who now sit opposite to us has altogether failed. In the meanwhile, we have no desire to inaugurate a factious opposition. We shall seek to do our duty to the country. We accept the opinion which the country has expressed, and we are prepared to support the Government wherever we can conscientiously support them, always provided that the votes we give are in accordance with the opinions we have expressed, and in harmony with the pledges we have given.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*,)—put, and *agreed to*.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 20*th August*, 1886.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee—Ordered — First Reading*—Butter Substitutes * [13].

Ordered—First Reading—Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) * [1]; Employers' Liability * [2]; National School Teachers (Ireland) * [3]; Mining Royalties * [4]; Registration of Voters (Ireland) * [5]; Sites for Churches, &c (Ireland) * [6]; Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) * [7]; Returning Officers' Expenses * [8]; Bankruptcy Court (Belfast) * [9]; Bankruptcy (Ireland) * [10]; Arbitration Courts (Scotland) * [11]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) * [12]; High Sheriff (Disqualification Removal) (Ireland) * [14]; Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment * [15]; Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty * [16]; Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment) * [17]; Miners' Wages * [18].

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

QUESTIONS.

——o——

ARMY—ARTILLERY—COMPLAINTS AS TO QUALITY OF FIELD OR MOUNTAIN GUNS.

COLONEL **HUGHES-HALLETT** (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any and what complaints have been received by the War Office, during the last five years, from General Officers commanding in the presence of the enemy, as to the quality of the field or mountain guns, or their carriages, lights, or ammunition, as supplied to the troops under their command; whether any and what complaints have been made, during the same period, to the Civil Department of the War Office by the Military Departments of the same Office; and, whether, in each case, if any such complaints have been made, he will lay them upon the Table?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes, Sir; complaints have been made by General Officers, in the course of the last five years, on the points mentioned by the hon. and gallant Member. General Officers are invited, and required, to make these complaints, which are examined by the Department at home, in order that the Service may benefit by experience gained in the field of any possible errors of manufacture or of administration; but I am unable to lay those Papers on the Table, as it would be injurious to the public interests that statements made in the most complete confidence and good faith should be published to the world without fuller explanation than could be given in a Return; and such a publication would have the effect of deterring officers from the full and free expression of their views which the War Office invites.

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Sir WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to institute any judicial inquiry, by means of a Royal Commission or otherwise, into the charges brought by Colonel Hope and others against the Ordnance Department?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster) asked that the Question might be postponed till Monday.

PARLIAMENT—THE COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE.

Mr. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What course the Government intend to take on the Report of the Committee on Procedure, and if they are prepared to recommend its adoption?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): In reply to the hon. Gentleman's Question I would state, without wishing to commit the Government in such a manner as might embarrass them in the event of the occurrence of unforeseen eventualities, but subject always to that qualification, that it would be the desire of the Government to ask the House to proceed with vigour and energy, when it meets next Session, with the consideration of the reform of the Procedure of the House of Commons, as deliberated upon by the Committee of the last Parliament. With regard to the second portion of the Question, whether we are prepared to recommend the adoption of the Report, the Government, of course, will be quite prepared to offer that as a basis for the consideration of the House, and also to state their general approval of its conclusions. But probably, like all other Reports of Committees, it would be open to some improvements by the general sense of the House.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—THE HESSIAN FLY.

Mr. HERBERT GARDNER (Essex, Saffron Walden) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether he has any official information as to the reported appearance of the Hessian Fly in parts of Essex and Hertfordshire; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government are taking steps with the view of warning farmers generally, and stamping out this agricultural pest?

The CHANCELLOR of the DUCHY (Lord John Manners) (Leicestershire, E.): No notice has been taken, in the Reports received up to this time from the collectors of the Agricultural Returns in either Essex or Hertfordshire, as to destruction of wheat by Hessian fly. Mr. Whitehead, who has prepared some extremely valuable Reports for the Agricultural Department on the subject of insects injurious to crops, states in his letter to *The Times* of the 18th instant that the Hessian fly is of the same *genus* as the wheat midge, to which he has referred in his Report No. 2, issued by the Privy Council in December last. I have directed a letter to be written to Mr. Whitehead asking him whether he can suggest any short and simple instructions which it may be useful to issue to the Local Authorities of any districts which may become affected by this pest. I may add that the Royal Agricultural Society have called attention to the possible danger, and have suggested means of prevention.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—SHELTER IN PALACE YARD.

Mr. W. BECKETT (Notts, Bassetlaw) asked the First Commissioner of Works, If, before the meeting of Parliament next year, he will provide such suitable protection from the weather for Members alighting at or departing from the House, as well as for both public and private vehicles in waiting in Palace Yard, as is provided at all principal railway stations?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket) (Dublin University): I shall do what I can to provide protection from the weather for Members alighting at or departing from the House; but I fear that it will be very difficult to devise any shelter for public or private vehicles which would not seriously disfigure the Court Yard.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTE.

Mr. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What measures are being adopted between

Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States for the purpose of bringing about an amicable settlement of those differences which have arisen regarding the Canadian fishery regulations; and, whether it is intended to appoint a joint Commission of the two Countries for the purpose of amending the Treaty of 1818?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.) (who replied) said: Communications are now passing between the two Governments with a view to effect a friendly settlement of the questions which have arisen in connection with the North American Fisheries. The negotiations, which have been conducted in communication with the Government of Canada, have not yet reached such a stage as would make it desirable to indicate the exact steps which may be taken by the two Governments in the matter.

TRUCK ACTS—THE EASDALE SLATE COMPANY.

DR. CLARK (Caithness) asked the Lord Advocate, If it is true, as stated by *The Oban Times*, that the workmen in the employ of the Easdale Slate Company are paid their wages partly in money and partly in goods; and, if the system in operation there is an infringement of the Truck Acts?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities), in reply, said, that he had not yet been able to obtain any facts in regard to the matter, and he would be glad if the hon. Member would postpone his Question.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL—LICENCES FOR SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government, either in their Local Government Bill or otherwise, to propose legislation altering the conditions under which licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors are obtainable?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Gentleman asks me a Question which it is rather difficult for me to answer in a manner which may be satisfactory to him. It is quite impossible for me to indicate to the House, with any kind of precision, what will be the contents of the Local Government Bill which the Government hope to introduce next Session. But, speaking generally, I suppose I may say this—that it would be almost impossible, I imagine, to eliminate, to any considerable extent, from the consideration of the question of local government, the consideration of the subsidiary question of the licensing power with regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors.

NAVY—H.M.S. "IMPERIEUSE."

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, with reference to the new armour-belted cruiser *Impérieuse* at Portsmouth, now fitting for trial at sea, Whether it is a fact that when her stores are all on board she will be immersed three feet deeper than her design warrants, and her armour-belt entirely under water; whether her torpedo lower portsills will then be flush with the water, and her armoured deck in the same position; whether she was designed to have three feet of armoured freeboard, which has thus been destroyed; whether she was designed to carry 1,100 tons of coal, which has since, under the circumstances, been reduced to 900 tons; whether the ship is to be sent to sea in the condition described, with her stability thus seriously affected, and her efficiency as a seaworthy fighting ship destroyed; whether the cost of hull and machinery amounts in round numbers to £485,000; whether there is reason to fear that similar errors may exist in the designs of the other belted cruisers now in course of building; and, whether he will cause strict inquiry to be made with a view to ascertaining upon whom really rests the responsibility?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The alleged difference between the actual and designed draught of the *Impérieuse* has been carefully investigated by the present Board of Admiralty, and we have ascertained that—(1) when the ship is complete with all her stores and coal on board, as designed, she will be 11½ inches deeper than her original designed line. This is due to known additions of weight of armament, machinery, &c., which have been accepted during the building of the ship, by which her speed has been increased to 17 knots as against 16 knots in the design. (2) In this condition the height of the three torpedo ports (lower edge) will be respectively—forward, 2 feet 10½ inches; amidships, 3 feet 2½ inches; aft, 2 feet 4½ inches. The height of the armour or belt deck will be 2 feet 3½ inches. (3) She was designed to have 3 feet 3 inches armoured freeboard, and this has been reduced, as above stated, to 2 feet 3½ inches. (4) She was designed to carry 400 tons of coal (as an average quantity) at her normal draught, with power to stow 900 tons when required. In subsequently settling the details of internal arrangements, it has been found possible to stow as much as 1,130 tons. Any quantity carried beyond the 400 tons of course means increased immersion. The extra immersion due to carrying 900 tons of coal is 14 inches beyond the 11½ inches above stated, or 2 feet 1½ inches. (5) The ship is to be sent to sea for an experimental cruise in company with the *Colossus*, starting with 900 tons of coal. The designers are quite satisfied with the stability, which is not at all appreciably affected by the increase of draught. (6) The cost of hull and machinery is about £485,000. (7) The sister ship *Warspite* will be in the same position. The Constructors' Department inform me that there is no reason to anticipate that the other belted cruisers will exceed their designed draught.

NAVY—ORDNANCE—THE 38-TON GUNS OF H.M.S. "AJAX."

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true, as recently stated in *The Admiralty and Horse Guards Gazette*, that practice with the four 38-ton muzzle-loading guns on board H.M.S. *Ajax* off the coast of Spain, had to be stopped in consequence of defective construction at the vents, which rendered practice dangerous; whether any Report thereon from the Admiral, or from the Captain of the Ship, has been received; and, whether he will lay it upon the Table?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing) (who replied) said: It is true that practice from the 38-ton guns of the *Ajax* was temporarily stopped in consequence of defects in connection with the vents. The guns have been thoroughly overhauled since the return of the ship to England by the officers of the War Department, who have reported that, owing to the nuts which secure the axial vents not having been properly tightened up, a small escape of gas had taken place, slightly eroding the steel of the gun tubes where the vent passes through them. These slight defects have been repaired, and the guns are now perfectly efficient and serviceable. Instructions have been issued to insure the proper tightening up of the screws in future.

POOR LAW—FLOGGING AT THE HANWELL PAUPER SCHOOLS.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been drawn to a report in *The Times* of the 18th instant, of the last meeting of the City of London Board of Guardians, when mention was made of a case of cruel treatment of an inmate of the Hanwell Pauper Schools, and the Chairman of the Board stated that

> "He was convinced that there was an unnecessary amount of flogging at the Hanwell Schools;"

and, whether he will cause proper inquiry to be made as to the truth of this allegation?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): My attention was drawn to the report in question, and I have directed that an explanation be called for from the drill master, whose conduct is in question. The Managers of the School District have also been asked for their observations as to the case, and as to the allegation that there is an unnecessary amount of flogging at the school. On receipt of the replies I shall take such action as may seem to me to be necessary. I may say that the regulations laid down at these schools as to corporal punishment are very strict, and that in no case, and under no circumstances, had the drill master any authority for inflicting corporal punishment.

GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND—LAW ADVISER TO THE LORD LIEUTENANT.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether an appointment has been made, or is intended to be made, to the office of Law Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No, Sir.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST RIOTS COMMISSION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can inform the House of the names of the two Members added to the Commission on the Belfast riots? Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would also say whether it is intended to ask Parliament to give powers to the Commission to order the attendance of witnesses as well as to administer oaths?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): That Question will depend upon the power that may be given to the Commissioners to administer the oath. With regard to the first Question of the hon. Member, I think I stated yesterday that I did not anticipate that I should be able to answer it to-day, and I would ask him to repeat it on Monday; but I have said nothing to imply that two Commissioners will be added to the Commission. It is necessary that a Judicial Commission of the kind should be small in number.

In reply to Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne),

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said: I did not intend yesterday to convey that the extension of the scope of the Commission would be of an important character. Of course, the scope of the Commission would be extended so as to include inquiry into the riots in August, as well as the previous riots. There are two other alterations, possibly of some little importance, which will be made in it, with a view rather to clear up the meaning of the Commission than to extend it. The proceedings and action taken by the magistrates will be interpreted to include the proceedings and action taken by either stipendiary or local magistrates; and the circumstances of the riots will be interpreted to include the origin of the riots and the causes of their continuance.

MR. SEXTON inquired whether the term "origin of the riots" would be held to include the present constitution and condition of the Orange Society?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, Sir; I should think not.

RUSSIA—RUMOURED OCCUPATION OF PORT LAZAREFF.

MR. SEAGER HUNT (Marylebone, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is a fact, as reported, that the Russian Government have occupied Port Lazareff in the Corea; and, if so, what steps Her Majesty's Government propose to take for the protection of British interests in the China seas?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The report referred to is probably a telegram from Pekin, which appeared in *The Times* on the 17th of July, that the Russian Fleet was threatening Port Lazareff. Her Majesty's Government have received no confirmation of that report, and Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg was informed by M. de Giers, on the 25th of July, that there was no foundation for the statement.

ARMY—MANUFACTURE OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c.

MAJOR GENERAL GOLDSWORTHY (Hammersmith) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will give instructions that the arms, ammunition, and equipment required for the Army shall be of Home Manufacture and not be obtained from abroad?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said, that, as far as was practicable, the arms and equipments of home manufacturers would be preferred; but there were some Army necessaries which we were not yet in a position to supply ourselves with, and which we were at present compelled to buy abroad. But, as far as possible, home manufactures would be preferred.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BILLS OF PRIVATE MEMBERS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Perhaps the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be good enough to say, Whether he contemplates adjourning the debate at an early hour, in order to enable hon. Members who have given Notice of Bills an opportunity of moving their introduction?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I should be very anxious, on any proposal of that kind, to consult the convenience of the House; and if there were any general desire on the part of the House to adjourn the debate again early to-night—by which, I suppose, is meant about 12 o'clock—the Government would be very ready to accede to it. But, perhaps, with the permission of the House, I may take this opportunity of stating the views of the Government with regard generally to the Notices of Motion, either as respects Committees or Bills, which have been given Notice of by private Members. Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it would be desirable, in the interests of hon. Members individually and generally, to limit the Business of Parliament solely to questions of finance, and to legislation which is indissolubly connected with questions of finance. That being so, we think that it would be extremely inconvenient that the progress of financial measures should be at all interfered with, or should be at all mixed up with questions of private legislation. The Government, therefore, after due consideration, deem it would be for the best, and that they will be acting most for the convenience of hon. Members, if they take on themselves the responsibility of placing Notices of opposition to all the private Members' Bills, and Notices of Motion, which are down on the Order Paper. Of course, the Government would much regret if any construction other than that I have stated were placed upon their action, or if it were supposed by any hon. Member who is interested in any particular Bill that the Government, by such action, committed themselves to any kind of expression of opinion as to the particular Bill which happened to receive Notice of opposition.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will the noble Lord agree to refer all these Bills and Notices to a Royal Commission?

[No reply.]

Mr. Labouchere

MOTION.

——o——

NEW WRIT—DOUBLE RETURN FOR BELFAST BOROUGH (WESTERN DIVISION) AND SLIGO COUNTY (SOUTHERN DIVISION).

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I beg to move—

> "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the Southern Division of the County of Sligo in the room of Thomas Sexton, Esq., who having been returned for both the Southern Division of the County of Sligo and the Western Division of Belfast has elected to serve for the Western Division of Belfast."

In making that Motion I should like to say——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That Motion cannot properly be made, and I decline to put it from the Chair, for this reason—that there is no vacancy for the Southern Division of Sligo, and there can be none. The hon. Gentleman was returned for the Southern Division of the County of Sligo and for the Western Division of the Borough of Belfast; and in the early days of the Session—the first or second day—he gave me notice that he elected to sit for one of those constituencies. I replied to him at the time that he was not in a position to make his election, for the reason that a Petition had been presented against his return for one of those constituencies. In my opinion, a Member cannot elect to choose which of the two constituencies he shall sit for until he has been duly returned for both of them. In this case he has not been duly returned for both of them, because his return for one of them is still *sub judice;* and it is an old and a very well-established and well-known practice of this House that until there is no question as to the return of a Member for either of the constituencies for which he is returned he is not able to make his choice of either. When I gave that advice to the hon. Gentleman, and told him I could not put the Motion or read his letter in which he elected to serve for one of these constituencies from the Chair, I was acting upon the precedent of Mr. O'Connell in 1841, who, having been returned for the two constituencies of Meath and Cork, gave a letter to the Speaker which was read from the Chair, in which he elected to serve for one of those constituencies.

The Speaker then stated that a Petition having been lodged against the return of the hon. Gentleman, Mr. O'Connell, for one of those constituencies, he was not in a position to make his election. Acting upon that precedent, and on the uniform practice of 100 years and long before that period, I declined to read the letter from the Chair in which the hon. Gentleman made his election; and I shall now, in the exercise of my discretion—subject, of course, to the will of the House, and after having given the best attention I could to the matter—decline to put the Motion to the House.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Perhaps you will allow me, Sir, to ask you whether you attach any weight to the consideration that in the case of Mr. O'Connell the seat for Cork, which he desired to take, was claimed in the Petition, whereas the seat for West Belfast is not claimed?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that that alters the view of the case. The words of the Standing Order are so expressed that if a Member is returned for two places he cannot elect to sit for either until there is no question of his return for both of them. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the consideration which the hon. Gentleman has stated as to whether the seat is claimed on Petition does not make any difference of principle.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): As a point of Order, I should like to ask you which place the hon. Gentleman sits for now?

MR. SPEAKER: It is a well-understood Rule of the House that if a Member is returned for two places he can sit; but for which place the hon. Member is now sitting it is impossible for me to say until the Court has decided upon his return.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—HOURS OF COMMENCEMENT.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I beg to suggest to the House that, as there is no Private Business before the House at the present period of the year, it might be convenient for us to commence Business at a quarter-past instead of half-past 4 o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August.]—[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Many of the objections which have been felt by us (the Irish Members) to the terseness of the Queen's Speech have been considerably removed by the character of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill). The noble Lord's speech was one of the most remarkable that has ever been delivered in this House. It was full, clear, and was, I think, the most significant expression of the policy of the Government; and I shall suggest some reasons why, in my opinion, Members, especially on this of the House, will be wanting in their duty to their constituents if they do not subject that speech to the most searching and prompt criticism and discussion. Before I advert to the policy of the Government, let me congratulate the noble Lord on the fact that he is in the grand position of being entirely independent of the support of the Orange tail of the Tory Party in this House. We endeavoured to bring the Tory Party into that position last November. We did not succeed. The Liberal Unionists have succeeded where we failed, and they have made the noble Lord entirely independent even of the hon. and gallant Colonel the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), whose patronage he found so unwelcome. The noble Lord has not been slow to inform the House of his emancipation. There was almost a scream of liberty and exultation in the emphasis with which the noble Lord separated himself from the Orange Party. He gave warning, in terms of unmistakable and admirable clearness, to the rioters of Belfast that, even although they did belong to the Orange brethren, they would be required to desist from murder and plunder even by a Tory Administration. The noble Lord must have been very pleased to have been able to turn his back on the Orange Party with such rapidity and emphasis, and to give the world another remarkable proof of that versatility which is one of his greatest characteristics. But, although we are bound to congratulate the noble Lord on his liberation, we cannot forget some of the incidents in connection with the Orange riots, and the speeches of the Orangemen of Belfast. I do not want to raise any controversy with regard to the past, which can be buried with decency and decorum; but the noble Lord cannot have been surprised at the laughter with which the statement was received on these Benches—that the Government intend to make a searching inquiry into the origin of the Belfast riots. The origin of the Belfast riots goes pretty far back, but I will not go further back than this—that the speeches of the noble Lord are the real origin of them. When we read those appalling accounts of men murdering their fellow-men in the name of religion, of men plundering houses and attacking women and children, we cannot forget that this is a rude translation into fact by the Orangemen of Ulster of those appeals which came from the noble Lord. The noble Lord spoke of the loss of 25 lives. I have no hesitation in saying that every man who has lost his life in those riots was a dupe and a victim of the noble Lord. Unfortunately, the bad example of the noble Lord was followed by some Members of his Party, and, I regret to say, by some Members even of Liberal Party. In the last Parliament the Orangemen of Belfast were told that the moment a shot was fired against them the sympathy of this country would be on their side. It was language like that which encouraged the Orangemen to shoot down not merely their fellow-subjects, but also the armed forces of the Crown. We cannot forget that an hon. Gentleman otherwise unknown to fame, who now sits for Aston Manor (Mr. Kynoch) announced, during his Election campaign, that he was willing to supply as many rifles and cartridges as the Orangemen required. I do not know if the hon. Gentleman was as good as his word; but what would be the feelings of this House if they should discover that some of the cartridges and rifles found in the streets of Belfast were supplied by a Tory Member? The noble Lord gave us a most charming picture of the state of Ireland. Everything seems to be going on very well except in Belfast and the county of Kerry. But how does that picture contrast with the one which appeared in Tory speeches and addresses during the General Election? Several of the hon. Gentlemen on those Benches declared to the constituencies of England that in Ireland murder and crime were stalking unchecked through the land, life was entirely insecure, and there was such a state of anarchy that it required a resolute Government which knew its own mind and did not require to resort to Commissions. If the state of Ireland is as Tory candidates described it at the General Election, the Government are criminally responsible in delaying one hour in bringing in legislation to put an end to it; but if that description made to the country was false and incorrect, then the noble Lord, or some other Member of the Tory Party, ought to get up and apologize to the people of Ireland for having slandered them, and to the people of England for having deceived them. The noble Lord informs us that one of his many Commissions is to inquire into "Boycotting" and intimidation in Ireland, and that the "sign post," the general basis of the Government policy with regard to Ireland, is that between Ireland and England there should be similarity and equality and simultaneity. Very well. But if there is to be a Commission to inquire into intimidation and "Boycotting," then it ought to apply to the whole of the United Kingdom; not merely into the proceedings of the National League in Ireland, but also into the proceedings of the Primrose League in England. During the last Election in England, "Boycotting" and intimidation were carried on by the Tory Party to an extent unprecedented and unparalleled; and so much was this the case, that I think I represent almost the consensus of opinion, at least among the Liberal Party, in saying that the question was being seriously considered whether they should not require a large change in the electoral legislation of this country; whether they were not bound to protect the labourer from requests that amounted to commands from his landlord, the shopkeeper from the visits of the dames and squires of the Primrose League, who accompanied a request for votes with threats of a removal of custom; and further whether, in order to secure anything approaching freedom of election, canvassing should not be made entirely illegal. Therefore, I say that if the noble Lord will only apply his principle of similarity and equality and simultaneity, we shall welcome the Commission. What is the policy of the Government? The hon. and learned Gentleman who seconded the Address (Mr. Maclean) summed it up with great simplicity—all the Government had to do was to follow the old French saying—"*J'y suis; J'y reste;*" as if the duty of Ministers was confined to drawing their quarter's salary. The Government seemed satisfied to pursue a policy of that description; but I should expect that even a Tory Ministry supposes it is sent into Office to redress grievances and remove abuses. The hon. and learned Gentleman to whom I have just alluded said that the verdict of the constituencies was final and irrevocable on the point that the Union in its existing form should be maintained. That proposition I entirely deny; and also that we have on these Benches a certain number of Gentlemen called Liberal Unionists, and that they went to the constituencies on the cry that the Union, in its existing form, should be maintained. Was it not their cry, rather, that they were in favour of large modifications of the existing Union? They only stopped short at the point reached by the Prime Minister's proposals. Aye, even Members of the Tory Party went considerable lengths in their demand for modification. As a matter of fact, there is not a section of this House which was elected on the principle of maintaining the Union in its existing position; and several sections of the House were elected on the distinct principle of making ample modifications. The hon. and learned Gentleman, first having mistaken the character of the verdict, went on, as I before observed, most mistakenly to say that it was final and irrevocable. The main charge against the late Prime Minister was that he had sprung Home Rule on the country, giving it little time to consider and discuss the proposal. But the Home Rule scheme was subject to the strong opposition of the united Tory Party, and to the misfortune of a divided and disrupted Liberal Party; and, in addition to that combination against it, the evil effect of the coupling with it the system of land purchase; and it is to the hatred and dislike of the system of land purchase proposed, or, rather, the hatred of the Irish landlords, which is now as prominent in English as in Irish feeling, that much may be laid for the defeat of Home Rule. In reference to this matter, I would call the attention of the House to the astonishing character of the vote in favour of the late Prime Minister—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. There were 1,338,718 votes in agreement with the scheme, and the voting against the policy amounted to 1,416,472. And, Sir, I would venture to say that never was a great proposal of Reform, under circumstances of so much difficulty, accorded such a large amount of support. Well, the decision of the country is final and irrevocable say hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side; but, Sir, what did the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) commit himself to in reference to this matter—to the statement that any policy of Reform which was accepted by the majority of the Liberal Party, although it might be temporarily postponed, yet it could never be finally defeated. Will the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale, or any man in this House, venture to contend that the policy of the late Prime Minister was rejected by the majority of the constituencies, and was not accepted by the overwhelming majority of the Liberal Party? Therefore, I say, Sir, acting upon the example of the noble Marquess, Home Rule, though rejected by the majority of the constituencies, is accepted by the majority of the Liberal Party in England. The late Prime Minister's policy may be postponed; but the verdict against it is not final or irrevocable, and the verdict that has been given, Sir, is one which very soon will be entirely reversed. Furthermore, the question of Home Rule was voted upon by England, by Scotland, by Wales, and by Ireland. Scotland decided in favour of it; Wales decided in favour of it; Ireland decided in favour of it—that is to say, three out of the four countries decided in favour of it, and but one country gave a vote against it, and that not of a very excessive character; and I think, Sir, it is a little too sanguine on the part of the Tory Party to assume that the policy which three out of four countries largely supported is a policy finally and irrevocably defeated. A point, Sir, entirely forgotten apparently is that the question put to the constituencies was simply the question how Ireland should be governed; and I submit, on the question of the rule of Ireland in the future, that the verdict of Ireland herself is the most potent. The right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) stated, in 1866 or 1867, that he held, with regard to the Government of Ireland, the principle which every Liberal held with regard to that and every other country, that such a form of Government as the majority of the Irish people demanded the majority should receive. Hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House informed the constituencies of England that the representation of Ireland in that Parliament had been filched by the National Party from the Irish people by intimidation, "Boycotting," and means of that nature; and even yet, notwithstanding the repudiation of the noble Lord the Chanceller of the Exchequer, the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh is still prepared to assert that proposition. The way to test the truth of such an utterance was to go to the constituencies at the polls. Why did not the Party who made such accusations send their men to the polls, the only test of the accuracy of what they had insinuated and declared? Hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House had the more pleasing duty of instructing the English electors and the Scotch electors. However, Sir, the fact is that the verdict of Ireland has been given for the second time, and by four-fifths of the Representatives of the Irish people. By that verdict every Irishman and every Liberal ought to be prepared to stand. These are a few of the reasons why I cannot consider correct the statement that the issue of the Elections is final or irrevocable. The noble Lord who leads the Government had declared his policy with regard to the Land Question at considerable length; and I am glad to say that, without infringing the Rules of the House, I think that I can illustrate the declarations of the noble Lord on the subject by other declarations which should be considered in connection with them. First, Sir, regarding the judicial rents, for example. There is a strange contradiction in much of the policy of the Government. The judicial rents are so sacred that they shall be maintained against all comers. The police shall be sent in strength; the soldiers shall be supplied in any amount to maintain them—aye, even if there is not a vestige of crime in Ireland; but the tenant merely makes a refusal to pay rent. In that event the noble Lord has said that the House should be called together, and the Government would ask it to give them the power to put into gaol every man unable or unwilling to pay the last farthing he has in the world. But, Sir, scarcely had the noble Lord finished his declaration with regard to the immutability of the sacredness of the judicial rents, when he went on to declare that a Commission of Inquiry and Examination, with the object of finding out whether those judicial rents were or were not sacred, was to be established. The words are—

> "The Commissioners will be appointed to inquire to what extent, if any, and in what parts of Ireland the operation of the Land Act of 1881 is without effect, either by combination to resist the enforcement of legal obligations, or by exceptional circumstances."

And so on. The pleasing duty of this Commission is to inquire if the judicial rents are rack rents or impossible rents. The policy is illogical, Sir, and unwise. It is illogical, because it declares, in one breath, that judicial rents are fixed and immutable, and, in the next, that they are matters of legitimate reformatory inquiry. It is unwise, Sir, because the Commission suggested will not meet before the end of next spring. Next spring, Sir, it is intended to report if the judicial rents are rents that can be paid by the tenantry of Ireland. Sir, everybody knows that by that time the question will have been settled. The crisis in Ireland, Sir, comes next November. The fall in the value of agricultural produce which is to be inquired into at the end of next spring exists, Sir, at the present moment. Already, Sir, the decline in the value of produce has proved that the judicial rents are impossible of payment; and, Sir, what satisfaction to the Irish tenant, thrown out to perish by the roadside in November, because he was unable to pay an impossible rent, is it to be informed that, had he held out a little longer, he would not have been asked to pay that impossible rent? Before the policy is able to be carried out at the end of next spring, Sir, there will be many a man and woman and child far beyond the reach of any relief that legislation can give. When the shivering farmer, Sir, is lying by the roadside, when his home is broken up, and his wife and children in the graveyard close by, what satisfaction will it be to him to be told that the rent, which cost him his home and laid low his wife and his children, was a rent which the Commission of Inquiry declared to be beyond his power of paying? This means, Sir, that the judicial rents are acknowledged by implication to be too high, for they are the subject of inquiry for a Commission; and the failure to pay that rent, whether it be high or low, whether it be just or unjust, will cause the tenant to be driven out on the roadside. The noble Lord was courageous enough to quote the late Prime Minister in proof of the statement that the judicial rents under the Land Act of 1881 were final. Sir, the late Prime Minister never committed himself to the statement that the Land Act was the last word to be said on the Irish Land Question. What he stated was that he declined at that time further to disturb social order in Ireland so completely as the Irish Members seemed to demand. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale is quoted by the noble Lord the Leader of the House of Commons as saying that the Land Act of 1881, as regards the dual ownership, was only a *modus vivendi;* but the noble Marquess himself was a very important Member of the Ministry which passed the Land Act of 1881. How, then, can he be quoted as saying that the Land Settlement was only a *modus vivendi*, and, at the same time, as an authority for saying that it was the final and last settlement of the Liberal Party? We must take the noble Marquess as a responsible Member of the Government of the late Prime Minister in 1881, and his words must be taken as showing and proving that the Land Act was not final. Accordingly, if the noble Marquess is a testimony, we have a right to call upon him in favour of our statement that neither the judicial rents, nor anything else in the Act of 1881, were regarded as final by the Government of that day. Take the nature of the clauses with regard to the judicial rent. The main provision shows that it was not meant to be final. Everybody knows that the judicial rent was fixed for a term of 15 years. Does not that mean that the rental was not regarded as an immutable thing which, under no change of circumstances, or times, or character, could be altered? When the late Prime Minister fixed the term of the judicial rent at 15 years, he meant to declare that the judicial rent should be subject to revision. If we are able to show that a revolutionary change of circumstances has occurred in Ireland since the Land Act was passed, we have a right to ask this House, fairly and frankly, to consider the question whether the period of revision was not fixed at too long a date, and whether circumstances have not occurred since which justify us in demanding that that term shall be largely curtailed. The judicial rents, however, should not, according to the noble Lord—and he was careful in saying it—be lowered. Whatever occurs, the landlord is to be saved. It may be at the cost of hundreds of thousands of Irish homes, at the cost of thousands of Irish lives, of millions of Irish money; but the landlords of Ireland must be saved. That is a portion of the policy of the Government I have a right to commend to the serious attention of the Liberal Leaders. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Maclean) speaks of the verdict against Home Rule being final and irrevocable; but there were two verdicts given—there were two things on which the constituencies pronounced. They pronounced upon the question of Home Rule, but they also pronounced upon the question of Land Purchase; and of the two verdicts that upon the question of Land Purchase was, by a great deal, the more emphatic. Do I not state the notorious facts of the case when I say that many hon. Gentlemen on the Liberal Benches were forced by their constituents to declare that they would never risk a penny of English money for the sake of the Irish landlords? If the verdict against Home Rule was irrevocable and so final, what shall we say to the verdict on the question of Land Purchase? I am not saying this in a spirit of controversy. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen laugh; but I am not dealing at present with any point that concerns them. It is a little family quarrel we have to settle on this side. Do we not recollect the fact that the main argument of a considerable number of Liberal Unionists against the late Prime Minister was his Land Purchase proposal; and who forgets the eloquent, impassioned, and potent language in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) called upon all classes and sections of the population in England and Scotland, and Ireland and Wales, to rise against the Home Rule proposals of the Prime Minister because of his land proposals? The Irish farmer was implored not to pay too much money for his land under the scheme of the late Prime Minister. The Scotch crofter was asked to contrast the generosity of the late Prime Minister to the Irish landlord with his niggardliness towards the Scotch crofter. The artizan, heavily burdened as he was with taxation, was asked not to put himself under fresh burdens by adopting the proposals of the late Prime Minister attached to Home Rule; and the labourers were implored not to support the late Prime Minister's Home Rule proposals unless they were prepared to sacrifice the three acres and the cow. I want to know, then, what is to be the attitude of these Liberal Unionists towards the Land Purchase proposals of the present Government? That Land Purchase policy of the Government, shadowed forth in the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, combines, I think, every possible objection that can be raised from the point of view either of the Irish farmer or of the English taxpayer. The one person only who would have a right to be contented with the Land Purchase policy of the Government is the Irish landlord. I must congratulate the noble Lord on the candour with which he declared his policy with regard to Land Purchase. He said—

> "A serious mistake will be made by any who think that Government contemplate any further dealings with the Land Question in Ireland in the direction of any revision of rent."

No; nothing is to be taken from the rent, whatever happens. If the Commission reports against the rent as too high, still the tenant shall be forced to pay so much money as will leave the landlord in the possession of the same amount of money interest in the land. I may illustrate this by quoting some words which were uttered "elsewhere" about the same thing. These words were—

> "If it should come out that the Courts have made blunders, and that there is an impossibility in any case of paying rent, I think it is not the landlords who should bear the loss."

The inference is that if the tenant is not able to pay, the State and not the landlord should bear the loss. The Rules of this House will not permit me to say who is the author of that statement; but I think that the House will readily guess who was the enlightened commentator who put the footnotes to the speech of the noble Lord, so that we might clearly understand the meaning. However high the rack-rent, the tenant is to pay it, or as much of it as he can, because the noble Lord does recognize that it may be impossible for him to pay the whole amount; and he goes on to say that, in that case, there will be an obligation of purchase by the State—that it shall be the State and not the landlords who must suffer. Even if it should be proved that prices have been so lowered that the tenant can no longer pay his rent the landlord is not to suffer. That is a startling doctrine with regard to landlordism. Now, we on these Benches have always preached the doctrine of honesty in Land Purchase. We have always declared that it was our duty not to allow the Irish farmers to be burdened with such terms as would give them no choice but between bankruptcy and repudiation. We were willing, under the proposals of the late Prime Minister, to put our national existence, our national liberties, our National Assembly, as the hostages for the full payment of the landlord's rent, and that duty has been made even more sacred by the events of the last Election. I am sure the late Prime Minister must feel rewarded, even amidst the failure of his projects, by the enormous change which has been produced in the feelings of the people of England and Ireland towards each other. There is not a man on these Benches among my Colleagues who does not feel profound gratitude to the working classes of England, Scotland, and Wales for the verdict they gave upon the Irish Question. Chicago is not the place where you go for any very gushing expressions of friendship towards this country—there are too many of the former friends of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the present Home Secretary there for that. Yet there the warmest expressions were used towards the working men of England. On this point, may I not remind the House of the words he has issued in praise of "true-hearted Irishmen" who have belonged to revolutionary societies in former times, men like Wolfe Tone and Robert Emmet? I quite agree with every single word of these utterances. ["Hear, hear!"] I accept the cheer of the right hon. and learned Gentleman as indicating that he adheres to what he said as to these men; and I am sorry he has found it necessary to allude, in terms of vituperation, to men of the present day who are seeking to obtain by Constitutional means practically the same ends as those gentlemen fought for by arms. Yet, Sir, I am sure that everybody on these Benches, and I am sure every rational man in England, will receive with gratification the information that, at the Irish-American Convention at Chicago, thanks were passed to Mr. Gladstone. The Irish Members on this question of Land Purchase have, then, a double obligation to the Irish farmer, and they have an obligation to the English artizan; and the obligation in both cases imposes the same duty—namely, not to accept any system of Land Purchase which, by giving an inflated price to the property of the landlords, places upon the Irish tenant a burden which he cannot meet, and which may have to be met by the British artizan. If the landlord is to get more than he is entitled to for the land, the security of the British taxpayer is so far damaged. Unless the Irish farmer makes a good bargain, the security of the British taxpayer is to that extent damaged; and, therefore, to any such Land Purchase proposal as is put forward by the Government, every section of the Opposition—Liberals, Radicals, and Nationalists, Liberal Unionists, above all others—are bound to give energetic, uncompromising, and constant antagonism. Well, Sir, that is not the only proposal of the Government with regard to the future of Ireland. They are going to maintain the judicial rents, and inquire into the question whether the tenants are able to pay the rents. The question, Sir, has passed out of the region of controversy. Any man with any practical acquaintance with the agricultural circumstances of Ireland, or of England, Scotland, and Wales, for that matter, for the three countries are very much alike, has come to the conclusion that we have approached a great crisis. Take up the papers every day, and what do we find? I read that a gentleman named Mr. Walter Morrison—I do not know if that is the hon. Gentleman of the same name who sits in this House for one of the Divisions of Yorkshire—returned no less than 50 per cent of his rents in 1884, and 60 per cent of his present year's rents. Even the noble Lord has been forced to acknowledge that the fall in prices had produced a grave crisis in England and Scotland; and I dare say we shall have the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Chaplin) proposing some measure for assisting the farmers of this country in the crisis which has been brought about by the fall in prices. I do not know whether he will have any better success in his position as an independent Member than when he sat on that (the Treasury) Bench; but, undoubtedly, it is admitted on all hands that the farmers of England cannot carry on their business without some remissions. In one paper I read that Mr. W. H. Smith—I presume that is the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War—had given a reduction of 40 per cent on his rents. I hope the right hon. Gentleman does not think that I am blaming him; but I argue that it is certain that a state of things which renders such reductions of 40 per cent necessary in England, *à fortiori*, renders a reduction of 40 per cent necessary in Ireland. You have better land in England. [An hon. Member: No, no!] No! that is an astonishing proposition. I suppose hon. Members of the Tory Party will also deny my next proposition—that you have a larger population. I remember that the Gentleman who said "No" distinguished himself in the last Parliament rather by his "Noes" than by his speeches. In England you have large markets—in Ireland we have none at all, except in two or three large towns, and we have to rely almost entirely upon exportation. In England you have the most perfect railroad system in the whole world—in Ireland we have a railroad system the deficiencies of which are the apology for some of the legislation which has passed this House. Does anyone say that reductions of rent which are necessary in a country of great fertility, of large markets, with a splendid railway system and great wealth, are to be denied in a country of small population, few markets, and imperfect and undeveloped railroads? I think I have proved that part of my statement, and I have only to go to the ranks of our opponents to find confirmation of my proposition. Sir James Caird, who is described by *The Times* as "a man whose authority on agricultural questions is universally recognized," declared that on 538,000 holdings Ireland the rent was perfectly irrecoverable, and *The Times* endorsed that statement in a leading article; but that was when the late Prime Minister was in power. It is the most extraordinary thing about the Irish farmer that he has as many changes of face and character as if he were the noble Lord, or the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department. When the Liberal Leader was dealing with the question of his rents, he was in a state of squalor and bankruptcy; but when the Tory Party comes to deal with the question, he is in a state of bloated and almost insolent prosperity. Well, Sir, we have besides the Land Purchase Scheme, in which the landlord is paid out of the pockets of the Irish farmer and the British taxpayer, a large system of public works. Everything is to be taken in hand—railways, tramways, even the fishes in the sea, will not escape the vigilant inquiries of the Government, and the benevolence of the State. What does all this mean? We were told in the late controversy that the Prime Minister—I mean the late Prime Minister; the right hon. Gentleman is so often Prime Minister that it is rather hard to avoid using the term—it is the normal condition of affairs which will soon recur in the late controversy, the late Prime Minister was denounced for charging on the taxpayers a burden of £50,000,000. We were told that the outlay would become a vast grant, reaching to £150,000,000—some of the Tory and Unionist Press actually said to £250,000,000, resting its burden on the shoulders of the British taxpayers. ["Hear, hear!"] I should like to know who said "Hear, hear," because I should like to cross-examine him. Well, this burden of £250,000,000, be it remarked, was to come from dealing unfairly and hardly with the landlords; but the Tory Party are now going to deal with the landlords, and deal with them in a far more generous fashion than ever the late Liberal Minister did; and if the land proposals of the late Prime Minister would have involved this country in a burden of £250,000,000 on his parsimonious and mean terms, surely the generous and large-hearted proposals of the present Government in the Land Purchase way will involve the country in a burden of £300,000,000. But they are going to spend money on railways, and trams, and fishes; and I think the most moderate amount which will be required for these various purposes may be put at £100,000,000—I might as well say a total of £500,000,000. I have sufficient confidence in the good sense of this House to know that they will at once repudiate and protest against any such policy as that. Well, Sir, I object to money being given to Ireland in the shape of disguised alms. We want to make Ireland a country of self-respecting and respected men—we do not want to make it a country of men bribed, demoralized, and cheated; and I lay this down—that money given to Ireland on any guarantee, except the guarantee of a central Assembly, responsible to Ireland and to this country, will be money that will be jobbed and wasted away. I know it is a popular thing to propose blank cheques on the Exchequer. I daresay in Ireland there may be some who would regard it as a good thing to have a blank cheque on the English Exchequer and the amount never to be repaid; but they are a very small class. Money spent on public works, on Bodies that are not representative, is bound to be wasted in jobbery; and money given to Ireland under circumstances like this is a curse to the people who give it, and a greater curse to the people who receive it. The policy of the Government is a policy which, I think, requires prompt discussion and prompt repudiation. After all, the Liberal Party is in the majority in this House, and to whatever section its Members belong they are all alike the guardians of the Treasury of this country. Further, we have in this Land Purchase scheme a coercive attempt to inflate the rents. If the tenant has no chance but to be turned out of his holding—especially if he be a husband or a father—the temptation is enormous that he should give an extravagant price for his holding, in order to purchase present peace even at the cost of future trouble. That is the policy of the Government—they make these proposals to the Irish tenants at a time when they are gagged and chained. The policy of the Government makes a declaration of war against the twice-repeated verdict of the Irish people. It is a policy that has issued a decree of starvation against hundreds of thousands of Irish tenants who are unable to pay their rents. It is a policy which, in the interests of the Irish landlords, is willing to sacrifice Irish homes, Irish lives, the peace and good feeling between England and Ireland. It is a policy which, for the sake of the Irish landlords, is willing to exhaust all the resources of the Exchequer, to more heavily burden still the burdened taxpayers of this country. A gigantic land scheme under this policy will be carried out, under every circumstance that will give inflated prices followed by bankruptcy in Ireland, while England is burdened with irrevocable debt. It is a policy of Land Purchase combined with a scheme of public works which is bound to lead to jobbery and demoralization. The Irish people are to be bribed into a surrender of their national demand by a blank cheque on the British Parliament; but I have much mistaken the temper of this House if to the unholy trinity of coercion, bankruptcy, and repudiation they will not give a final and irrevocable answer.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): According to the usual arrangements of this House, it unfortunately happens that the Leader of the Opposition addresses the House before the statement made by the chief Member of the Government. The result on this occasion has been that my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) was compelled to address the House before the important speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the Irish policy of the Government. That is greatly to be regretted, because the statement of the views held with reference to that speech by Gentlemen who sit upon this side of the House would undoubtedly have come from my right hon. Friend with exceptional weight. It is necessary, however, that we should make some remarks upon the very important declarations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Certainly, nobody can complain that this statement was wanting in definiteness and precision. In stating the views of the Government upon the subject of Ireland he laid down certain fundamental propositions. He first of all challenged the policy of the late Government in connecting the three questions of social order, of land, and of local government, and then declared that the present Government would adopt a totally different principle; that they did not regard those three questions as connected; and that they would be dealt with separately, in great part at any rate. But upon the most important question of all, the question of social order, the noble Lord was extremely distinct; for at the very commencement of his speech he made this most important statement, which I consider to be the keystone of the whole policy of the Government. He said—"Social order we mean to treat as a question absolutely by itself." Now, Sir, that statement, the House cannot understand too well, takes direct issue with the views and policy of the late Administration. We have always regarded—we do now regard—the question on principle—and I venture to say that it is a fundamental principle, and always has been and I trust always will be a fundamental principle, of the Liberal Party — that social order cannot be treated with success as a question absolutely by itself. Every action of the Liberal Party from generation to generation has been founded upon the principle that social order is a question that cannot be treated by itself; that social order depends upon the removal of the grounds out of which social order arises. That is the principle of the Liberal Party, and the noble Lord has justly challenged it. Lord Salisbury, in a speech some months ago, said that the principles upon which the Tory Party would govern Ireland were the traditional principles of the Tory Party. The noble Lord has enumerated and proclaimed the traditional principles of the Tory Party, when he said that they would deal with social order, and treat it as a question absolutely by itself. That was the principle upon which the Tory Party acted at the conclusion of the last and the commencement of the present centuries—that was the principle of Lord Eldon and Lord Castlereagh; it was the principle of Lord Sidmouth; it was the principle upon which all their acts were founded—it is the fundamental principle of the Tory Party, and to that principle we have been, and we always shall be, radically opposed. The Government are going to invoke distinguished warriors to aid them in carrying out that principle. But that principle was invoked and attempted by a warrior who was more distinguished than any whose services the Government can now demand. That was the principle which in the early part of the century the Duke of Wellington attempted to carry out. Now, Sir, social order, in our opinion, cannot be treated as a question by itself. Social order can never be treated except in concert with the redress of those grievances out of which the social disorder has arisen; for social disorder is not the evil itself—it is but the symptom of the evil. If you are to seek to remedy it, you must first of all understand the nature of the evil with which you have to deal; and I venture to say that we who profess the principles of the Liberal Party are bound to say that no Government, whether in Ireland or in any other country, can succeed upon a principle which starts with treating social disorder as a question to be treated absolutely by itself. In those days, when social disorder was treated by itself, as the noble Lord proposes to do, we were told by a great authority—and we accepted the principle at the time, and we accept it still, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman adheres to it himself—that "force is no remedy." What does that mean, except a condemnation of the principle that social order is to be treated as a question by itself? Well, Sir, it is against that principle that we have protested, not in England alone, not in Ireland alone, but all over the world. What was it that was preached to foreign countries in the despatches of Lord Palmerston? Nations that were suffering from social disorder, nations that were endeavouring to treat social disorder absolutely by itself, were told by us that that was a false principle in political ethics. We told them that no Government could succeed which treated social disorder as a question by itself, which endeavoured simply to put it down. I am old enough to remember the days when there was social disorder in England, when men were shot in the streets of towns in Lancashire. In the midst of all the distress there occurred the bread riots of Preston in 1843 or 1844 under the Government of Sir Robert Peel. Was social disorder in that instance treated by itself by Sir Robert Peel? Was that condition of almost unbroken tranquillity which England has now enjoyed for 40 years brought about in that way? No, Sir; social disorder then was cured by the repeal of the Corn Laws. That is an example of how impossible it is to adopt the principle of treating social disorder as a question by itself. No doubt you can put down social disorder by means of a distinguished General and bayonets. Cavour once said—"You may do anything with bayonets except sit upon them;" but, whatever effect you may produce by treating social disorder by itself, you never will produce a condition of permanent repose. That, I contend, has always been the principle on which the Liberal Party have acted. Was the social disorder of 1829 dealt with by treating it by itself? No, Sir; it was accompanied by the Act of Emancipation. Then, again, there was social disorder in 1832 and 1833; but that was followed by the settlement of the tithe question. There was social disorder in 1866 and 1867, and that was dealt with by the Irish Church Act. Therefore, I say, in contradiction of the principle enunciated by the Government, you cannot deal with social disorder by itself. You must endeavour to deal with the causes from which that social disorder arises. But how are you to treat this question of social disorder? The principle for which we have always contended, and shall always contend, is that you never can have social order in any country except where the people who are governed are in sympathy and in harmony with the Government under which they live. That is the fundamental principle of the Liberal Party. That is the principle which we have applied to England, and which we have endeavoured to apply to Ireland. Unless you can reach that end, unless you can find a method of bringing the subject into sympathy and harmony with the Government under which they live, you cannot reach social order by any method, I care not what it is, you choose to adopt. You may say you have tried all these things in Ireland. You have tried emancipation; you have tried the settlement of the tithe; you have tried the Land Act, and still you have social disorder. But what is the conclusion you should arrive at from that state of circumstances? Is it that the principle upon which you have proceeded is wrong, or that you have mistaken the symptoms and have not yet touched the real cause of the evil—that there is something else which prevents the harmony between the subjects and the Government under which they live? But, you will say, what is the cause? Everyone must admit that one of the main causes of social disorder and discontent in Ireland is the want of the satisfaction of the national sentiment; and, in my opinion, until you have removed that source of social disorder you will never reach the true remedy for the evil you desire to cure. I have said that the principle of the Liberal Party is that you can never cure social disorder until you bring the people into harmony with the Government under which they live; but I should be doing injustice to the Tory Party opposite if I were to say that none among them share that sentiment. Allow me to read a sentence to the House. In doing so I shall observe the same caution as the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), who has just sat down, and I will not tell the House the source from which this quotation proceeds; but hon. Members will be able, I think, to make a pretty shrewd guess at it. The sentence runs as follows:—

> "There are many Viceroys who have been brought face to face with this grinding pauperism in Ireland. Why have they all failed? Many reasons may be given, but perhaps this reason will be found deep down in the question —there has been a serious want of accord between the English and Irish nations. The Irish heart is not attuned in concert, and until that sympathy is in some degree restored there cannot be a satisfactory settlement of the Irish Question."

I will break my promise, and will say that those are the sentiments of the last Tory Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. You think you are going to settle the question of social order by itself. Has that experiment never been tried? Have you not tried from generation to generation to settle social order by itself? Are you so vain as to think you are so superior in the art of governing to all who have preceded you that you will succeed where they have failed disastrously? You give no credit to Liberal Governments. You say they have never honestly tried to enforce the law. You will hardly say that of the administration of Lord Spencer. But I will make you a present of Liberal Governments, and I will assume that they were either incompetent or unwilling to maintain social order in Ireland. I will ask you what has been the experience of Tory Administrations in Ireland? You will not condemn them; you will not say that they were unwilling or that they were incapable of maintaining social order in Ireland. What was the experience of the Tory Governments of the Earl of Derby and of Mr. Disraeli in 1867? They were responsible for the government of Ireland. It was at that time the Fenian outbreak and the Clerkenwell explosion occurred. Why did not they settle social order by itself in 1866 and 1867? I will take another Government of much longer life—that of Lord Beaconsfield from 1874 to 1880. There were able administrators in the Government of Ireland; it included the present Chief Secretary and the Dukes of Abercorn and Marlborough as Lords Lieutenant. Were they incompetent men, who did not understand the arts of government? And were they able to establish social order by itself? What was the result of six years of their administration? Read the letter addressed by Lord Beaconsfield to the Duke of Marlborough, in which he said, if I remember rightly, that the condition of Ireland, after six years of Tory Government, was a condition worse than that of pestilence or of famine.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): No, no!

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Well, I have not the words with me; but I think I have quoted them correctly.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The words to which the right hon. Gentleman refers were that if measures for which the right hon. Gentleman has since been responsible were introduced into Ireland the condition of things would be worse than pestilence and famine.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am very sorry I have not the words here;

but I venture to say that before to-morrow the House will have the opportunity of verifying the words of the letter in which Lord Beaconsfield described a condition of veiled rebellion in Ireland as a condition in respect of social disorder which was disastrous. Well, that was the condition of Ireland at the conclusion of six years of Tory administration in 1880. But we have had a more recent Tory Administration. There was one from June or July of 1885 to February, 1886. They had six months to establish social order by itself in Ireland. I suppose they will not say they deliberately relaxed the law; they will not assert they did not use all the arts of government to maintain social order in Ireland. And what was the result of that six months' experience? They came down and said they had totally failed, and they proposed a policy of repressive measures. Therefore I do not ask to be judged by our standard; but, judging you by your own standard—that of Tory administration—I say that the policy of attempting to establish social order by itself has been tried by you and it has failed. What has been our policy in this respect with respect to other portions of the Dominions of the Queen? You had a rebellion in Canada; and did you attempt to establish social order by itself in Canada? On the contrary, you met the national sentiment of Canada, and you established social order in Canada by giving Canada what she wanted. There were many predictions of evil consequences on that occasion. I wish I had here the speech made by the late Lord Derby upon the terrible dangers that would arise in Canada in consequence of the concession of local self-government. It was said that it would lead to absolute separation between the two countries, and to the declaration of a Republic in Canada. That only shows how vain are apprehensions of that character. Well, you think you will treat social order by itself apart from everything else. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER here offered the right hon. Gentleman a copy of the book containing the letter referred to.] The noble Lord will have the advantage presently of reading it; but I will take the critical question of "Boycotting," which is, in my opinion, one of the greatest offences against social order that can be committed. What did Lord Salisbury say on that subject in his Newport speech? And I believe more recently he spoke to the same effect. He said you cannot put it down by the ordinary law; and he much doubted whether you could put it down by any exceptional law. How, then, are you going to put it down by itself? How are you going to restore social order with respect to "Boycotting"—by the operation of any number of general or any number of exceptional laws? You can only put it down by removing the causes out of which it arises. The question of social order cannot be dealt with solely by itself. Therefore, your fundamental principle is one against which we on this side of the House feel bound absolutely to protest. The principle for which we contend is exactly the opposite. We say that social order cannot be restored by dealing with it by itself; it can only be restored by removing the causes which have led to the disorder. That is the principle of the Liberal Party for which, whether in a majority or a minority, we are bound to contend. The noble Lord went on to the question of the land, and on that he took the line of the absolute finality of the settlement of 1881. He said that nothing should induce him to depart from that finality, to which he maintained my right hon. Friend had pledged the country and the House. But it is from those Benches the first attack on the finality of the Land Act comes. There was a Notice given the other night by the great Irish henchman of the noble Lord—the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson); and that Notice overturns the whole fabric of the Land Act, for it is a Motion to include leaseholders within its operation; and yet, after this Notice is given behind his back, the noble Lord attempts to insist on the finality of the Land Act of 1881. But he says the Land Question is to be treated apart, by itself, and distinct from every other question. That is not consistent with another part of his statement; because he says the Land Purchase Bill of 1885 may be altered and improved upon one condition, and that is that the additional security is given by the Local Authorities. Well, that connects the Land Question with the question of local self-government; because where are the Local Authorities to come from except from the plan of local self-government to which he is opposed? Therefore, at every point you find the principle enunciated by the Government of treating these questions separately is one which is not only entirely unstatesmanlike, but practically impossible. You cannot separate one of these questions from any other; they are absolutely one and indivisible. But the noble Lord says he will deal with the Land Question apart. Well, there is against him a high authority who says—

> "There can be no doubt that in certain parts of Ireland the Land Question is at the root of the condition of social order. There are certain parts of Ireland in which the poverty is so great and the condition of the people is such that until the poverty is removed all hope of restoring prosperity is simply delusive."

That is the testimony of the last Tory Lord Lieutenant.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: He is not a Member of the present Government.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am told he is not a Member of the present Government. Well, Governments in these days succeed each other rapidly; and I know the noble Lord is quite at liberty to repudiate Lord Carnarvon if he likes. I am quite content to quote this as an authoritative opinion, for Lord Carnarvon was responsible for several months for the government of Ireland, and he knows its condition. If what Lord Carnarvon says is true, the Land Question cannot be dealt with separately. He says it is at the root of the whole Irish Question and the question of social order. Much has been said about agricultural distress, a question on which I do not profess to be an authority. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool has quoted the well-known letter of Sir James Caird, which has not been without its effect upon the Irish people. It has been denied that the land in Ireland is poorer than the land in England. No doubt, there is some rich land in Ireland; but the greater part of the land is certainly poorer than that of England. Sir James Caird distinguishes between 538,000 holders of land under £6 rental, and 121,000 holders at a higher rental; and speaking of the 538,000, he said, from his knowledge and observation, that economical rent had ceased in Ireland. Sir James Caird said that it was absolutely true that from 538,000 holders in Ireland any economical rent had for the present disappeared. Now, the commentary of *The Times* upon that was to show how unprofitable was the proposal of the late Government to buy land which would yield no rent. The object of *The Times* was to show that rent from such tenants was irrecoverable by anybody—the landlords, the English Government, or the Irish Government. Now, do you suppose that a paper like *The Times*, the representative of the propertied classes of this country, would make a statement of that kind—a statement which would be known in every village and house in Ireland—without being certain of its *data?* A fact like that is not to be got rid of, because the newspaper now says there was no difficulty about paying rent, and that to suggest that there was a difficulty was absurd. I say it is impossible that any statement like that can go forth in *The Times* without having the greatest effect on the conditions of any country. Now, the noble Lord says that the great distress had arisen from the depression of prices. ["No, no!"] Well, I am sure many hon. Members behind him will not say "No, no!"

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I object to being misquoted.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) below the Gangway will not contradict me. Well, the noble Lord says the fall has only been in corn, and does not affect Ireland. The noble Lord has his explanation ready. It is that the Irish farmers make their butter so badly. How is it that the Irish farmers have developed this failure to make butter within the last few years? Is there any Gentleman who knows anything of dairy produce who does not know that there has been a great fall in prices? The noble Lord has just handed to me this extract from the letter to the Duke of Marlborough. The extract is—

> "Nevertheless, a danger, in its ultimate results scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine, and which now engages your Excellency's attention, distracts that country."

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman read the last paragraph, describing the danger? I am sure he would not wish to mislead the House.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: This is the end. ["No!"] I know the noble Lord has a hereditary interest in the passage. The letter is rather long.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: There is the passage I wish you to read.

Mr. SEXTON: Read it all.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Lord Beaconsfield says—

> "Nevertheless, a danger, in its ultimate results scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine, and which now engages your Excellency's attention, distracts that country."

Well, that describes the condition of Ireland at the close of six years of Tory administration. Then he says that—

> "A portion of its population is attempting to sever the Constitutional tie which unites it to Great Britain in that bond which has favoured the power and prosperity of both."

But that was all under the auspices of a Tory Government. Why did not the Tory Government put an end to all this? It was under the auspices of that Government that the Land League was inaugurated. It grew from infancy to manhood under the Tory Administration, and the last act of that Tory Administration was to institute a prosecution of the Land League, which it did not go on with. It is, therefore, clear that a Tory Government of six years is not an absolute panacea for social disorder. I do not wish to carry it further. Let me go back to the condition of land tenure in Ireland. Not only is it seriously affected in that country by low prices, but here in England the agricultural interest has suffered also. Indeed there is scarcely a country in the world that has not suffered from agricultural depression. Such has been the case in America and in almost every country in Europe. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool has referred with approbation to the conduct of the English landlords in view of the present depression—that is to say, they made a reduction of rents in consequence of the depression. Well, I am inclined to refer with approbation to the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith), who was sent by the last Tory Government to Ireland on a special mission to propose to the Irish landlords moderation in the exaction of rent, and, no matter what the result of that special mission was, a better Commissioner could not have been sent, for he was willing to preach to the Irish landlords not only by precept but by example. Well, what was the course taken by Lord Carnarvon last year when he was not repudiated by the noble Lord? Why, Lord Carnarvon, addressing the Irish landlords I think somewhere in the North of Ireland, implored them to exercise moderation in the interests of good government; not to press on evictions which would make the task of good government well nigh impossible. What has been the language of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) on this question? At a time when the English landlords are, from a sense of justice or humanity or policy, exercising the most extreme moderation in the exaction of rents, although their legal rights are unimpaired, the noble Lord, addressing the landlords of Ireland, says that the policy of the Government will be to see that all the legal obligations and processes arising out of the Irish Land Act are strictly enforced and carried out so far as they come within the province of the Government; and that if there are any persons in this House of opinion that there will be by the Government any interference with or suspension by neglect, or by executive action of the right of the landlords to recover their lands in the event of non-payment of rent, they fall into a great and serious error. I do not complain of the assertion of the sacredness of legal obligations; but I do think it matter for regret when language of this sort is employed as an incitement and an indication to the landlords of Ireland to exact the utmost farthing—language which can only be understood, both by them and by their tenants, as an assurance that whatever may be the agricultural distress or the incapacity of particular tenants to pay their rents, if they will only evict the tenants they shall have the whole armed force of the British nation at their backs. Indeed, no language on the part of a responsible Government could at this moment be more dangerous to the cause of social order. Well, but all this time, as the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool has just said, you betray your own distrust of your own position by appointing a Commission to inquire into the question whether or not those men whom you say shall pay the whole rent can pay the whole rent; and then you make the extraordinary proposition that if they can not pay the whole rent—it is not the difference in the rent, as I understand, that Lord Salisbury proposes to pay; what he does propose to pay is to buy up at a capital sum, at the expense of the British taxpayer, land upon a rental which it is impossible the land could ever obtain—the very proposition denounced by the *The Times* in connection with the letter of Sir James Caird. Now, I am bound to say my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham who sits near me (Mr. Chamberlain)—["Oh, oh!"]—well, we have differed upon many subjects, but I take great care in mentioning one on which we agree—had considered this question and he had a remedy for it. Everyone will remember his proposal contained in a speech by him on the second reading of the Government of Ireland Bill. One remarkable part of the settlement which he suggested was that a settlement pertaining of the character of purchase should be preceded by a stay of evictions. Now, what does that mean? It meant the conviction on the part of my right hon. Friend that it was not safe to use the language which the noble Lord has used to encourage an increase of evictions on the part of Irish landlords, and that whatever settlement you come to must be in the interest of social order—I remember he called it the "Truce of God," which must be continued until a new settlement was arrived at by a proposal to stay evictions. I venture to say that whatever faults that scheme might have —and it had faults—it had not the grievous fault which the scheme of the Government has of precipitating the policy of eviction and of recommending its increase. I have said that the Government are going to refer this question to a Commission. It is a very extraordinary proceeding. So far as social order is concerned they do not want any Commission at all. That they settle by itself; and it is to be settled, as we understand, by a distinguished General. But with regard to the other questions they have Commissions. I should say that the plan of the Government, as I understand it, is, as regards social order, a Government by Generals, and as regards all the rest it is a Government by Commissions. This resort to Commissions by the Government reminds me of an artist once described in a speech of Canning's, in which he spoke of an artist who had devoted his attention specially to the development of a particular class of painting. He was an admirable artist in red lions. He was applied to by the owner of a public-house for his opinion with regard to a signboard, and he at once recommended a red lion, and the red lion was painted accordingly. His next client consulted him with regard to the painting of a country house, in the drawing-room of which a large compartment had been left to be filled in subsequently. "I want," says the owner, "some painting to suit this place." The artist at once said—"Do not you think a very handsome red lion would suit?" And then Canning described how the gentleman consented with some reluctance to the red lion. The gentleman then took the artist to his library and showed him a small compartment, and said that he wanted something of a choice character there. The artist said—"Do not you think we might put a small red lion here?" The Commissions to be appointed by Her Majesty's Government partook of a character similar to the red lions of the artist described by Canning. If it is the Land Question they have a handsome Commission; if it is the question of developing the industrial resources of Ireland it is a small Commission; but, whatever it is, it is always a Commission. It is practically the only picture of statesmanship which Her Majesty's Government appear to command. But the noble Lord says—"Oh, of course, we have Commissions because we have no intuition." But they were not always so wanting in intuition as they are now. In requiring until the spring to inquire—why, we remember that only one Gentleman constituted himself a Commission last year—the present Secretary of State for War—he did the whole of the Government Commission business at that time. He was sent over to Ireland; he did not wait to the end of the spring—no, 24 hours was enough for him; he did not show that want of intuition of which the noble Lord complained on the part of the Government. But really there is some advantage in these short intervals of administration. I wish to remind the noble Lord that this time last year they had had every opportunity for seven months to make themselves acquainted with all those subjects connected with the Irish

Government of which now they say they are wholly ignorant. They had the assistance of the whole machinery of the Irish Government. They had the Lord Lieutenant, they had the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, as well as other sources of information; and now, after the lapse of six months, they come forward and say—"We have no intuition; we know nothing about Ireland; do not hurry us." In the meanwhile, however, there are questions which will be hurried. Though it may be unfortunate that we have a Government without intuition, and though we have a Government which, in spite of being in the occupation of power and with the means of knowledge at their disposal for many months last year, and who now know nothing about these Irish questions, there are at the same time questions which give no repose to Governments. They had knowledge enough at that time without going to inquire of one of the questions to be referred to a Commission—whether rent has been at all affected by combinations in Ireland which operate on rent. They made up their minds on that subject last year; they determined in January to suppress the National League. It would seem that at that time they wanted not that information for which they are now waiting; but when this Commission is appointed I would ask, with the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), what it is to do? It is to inquire whether the land can pay the rent; but it is to be absolutely excluded from making any alteration in the rent after making the inquiry. Of course, the Commission would not make the alteration; but the noble Lord has said that rent is out of the question altogether. What, then, is this Commission to do? If it reports in accordance with Sir James Caird and *The Times* that 538,000 tenants in Ireland cannot pay rent at the present time, what is to be the consequence of that? We ought to have some answer from the Government to that question. Then there is the small Commission on Public Works. We know what that means. I have heard with some satisfaction the language of the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool on the attempt to bribe the Irish people by dangling before them this bribe. That experiment has been tried a great many times and for a great many years. There were times in which it was successful; but there is one feature now—and I think we ought to acknowledge it to the Irish people now—that it is impossible to bribe the Irish people by gold to abandon their national aspirations. If that attempt is made by the Government it will, in my opinion, absolutely fail. The last point is that of local government. That, too, the noble Lord thinks can be satisfactorily dealt with by itself. There was a topic which the noble Lord did not deal with, and that is the question of the existing system of administration in Ireland, which is ordinarily described as the Castle Government. Now that system of administration, I think, has been universally condemned. It has been condemned perhaps in the strongest language that has been employed on the subject by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. He used very emphatic language on that subject, and said that the Government of Ireland was like the Government of Poland in respect of its administration. It has been admitted, I think, by my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) that the present system of administration in Ireland is indefensible. I have seen it stated by many Conservative speakers at the last Election that they thought it ought to be reformed; but on that great, burning, urgent question the Government are absolutely silent. They express no opinion; they hold out no expectation or hope that there are to be any reforms in the administration of Irish Government. If I were to take the speech of the noble Lord, I might describe it by a variation of the well-known phrase on the return of Louis XVIII. to France—I might say with regard to the noble Lord's declaration respecting the Government of Ireland, "There is nothing gained; there is only an English General the more." But the noble Lord proceeds to say what the Government intends to do with regard to local self-government. He said—

> "The Queen's Speech of January last announced the introduction of a Bill with regard to local government in England as well as in Ireland, and considerable progress had been made with the details of that scheme when the Government were roughly and incontinently ejected from Office. Speeches made at the time by those who are Ministers now would, I think, throw a great deal of light in the direction in

which Her Majesty's Government will probably work. Nothing has occurred since which would lead us in any way widely to extend the limits of the policy we then laid down. On the contrary, everything that has occurred since then has tended to confirm and strengthen us in the view we then took on the subject of local government. The great sign-posts of our policy were at that time and are still equality, similarity, and, if I may use such a word, simultaneity of treatment as far as is practicable in the development of a genuinely popular system of local government in all the four countries which form the United Kingdom."

Well, now, at all events, I must compliment the noble Lord that he has made considerable progress since last February. What is his proposal now? He says—

> "We are of opinion that measures of local self-government, and of similar character and at the same moment, should be introduced for all the four countries."

What was his language last year?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Exactly the same.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Ah, no! This is what he said on the 21st of January—

> "I do not know whether, in the course of time, a change may come over Ireland which may possibly encourage the Government to press forward upon the attention of Parliament a measure such as I have described; but this I will say, that the present state of Ireland is not, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, one which would be favourable to the consideration of a measure for establishing local government in Ireland."—(3 *Hansard*, [302] 180).

And yet he says that is exactly the same as he said last night. In the Queen's Speech of January there was a broad distinction drawn between the recommendations of local government for Great Britain and for Ireland. In that Speech it was said—

> "Bills will be presented to you for transferring to representative bodies in the counties of Great Britain local business that is now transacted by Courts of Quarter Sessions and other authorities."

But what was there said about Ireland?—

> "A measure for the reform of county government in Ireland is already in preparation."

Now that was said one day, and the very next day the noble Lord gets up and says that—

> "In the opinion of the Government, the state of Ireland is not one which would be favourable to the consideration of any measure extending local government to Ireland."

The condition of Ireland has so much improved under our administration that now the noble Lord thinks it is favourable to the consideration of such a question. The real truth is that after our policy they must introduce a measure of local self-government, and that is the explanation of the change which has taken place. Well, so much for the "simultaneity" of the policy. But it is to be "similar and equal" to the local self-government to be proposed for England and Scotland. I challenge that principle. I believe it to be an absolutely false principle. I believe it to be impolitic and unstatesmanlike. I say that from an authority which the noble Lord will possibly respect. I will read it first and will tell him afterwards who the author is—

> "Justice to Ireland is said to mean identity. I believe that to be the greatest folly that can be brought forward. I have always thought that the greatest cause of the misery in Ireland was an identity of institutions with England, and I venture to lay down as a principle that the government of Ireland should be on a system the reverse of that in England."

Those are the words of Lord Beaconsfield—

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: About forty years ago.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Ah, yes; about the age of the noble Lord. Nevertheless I believe the words to be perfectly true. But I will read another authority to the noble Lord, not in 1843, but in the year 1885—

> "A local authority is more exposed to temptations and has more facility for enabling the majority to be unjust to the minority than is the the case where the authority derives its sanction from and extends its power over a wide area."

Now, mark, that is one of the weaknesses of a local authority; but—

> "in a large central authority the wisdom of the several parts of the country will correct the folly and mistakes of one. In a local authority that correction is to a much greater extent wanting, and it would be impossible to leave that out of sight in an extension of any such local authority to Ireland."

That is the opinion of Lord Salisbury himself. Founding myself, then, on the authority of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, I denounce the principle of identity and similarity of institutions as between England and Ireland as absurd. Why, what was the principle of the Union with Scotland? What would have become of the Union with Scotland if there had been men unstatesmanlike enough in those days to say that the principle of the Union with Scotland should involve similarity of institutions as between Scotland and England? Every institution of local government and of everything else—of law, of the defence of land, of every principle of government in Scotland—is different from the principle of government in England, and I say that if you should endeavour to apply your principle of similarity of institutions to Scotland as you threaten to apply them to Ireland you would create a rebellion. Scotland never has tolerated, and never will tolerate, such a principle as that enunciated by the noble Lord. The very essence of local government is that it should accommodate itself to local habits and sympathies, and to the peculiar feelings and particular wants of the population. A greater, a more conspicuous error than to impose a system of local self-government in a cast-iron frame upon the four different Nationalities within the United Kingdom it is impossible to conceive. Therefore, I again challenge that principle of local government. I have quoted two Conservative authorities, but I have yet another. I have used him twice. I will use him a third time. I am using him as if he were a Commission. I will give the noble Lord an opinion that is not 24 hours' old.

> "I have heard a great deal lately as to the value of giving identical institutions to England and Ireland. It is a very large question, but I must say it is true only up to a certain point. Ireland does not want the same institutions. Ireland cannot bear them, and to force them on her may not only be useless but harmful."

That is the opinion of the last Tory Lord Lieutenant. It is the opinion of every man who knows Ireland. To give Ireland the same or similar institutions to England is exactly to give her the very thing which she does not want and most detests. But I will not detain the House too long. I fully recognize that the scheme we proposed to the House and to the country has been disapproved and been rejected; but the Gentlemen who sit on those Benches, as they have the right, so they have the duty, to propose their remedy in its place. It is our duty to examine the principle upon which that scheme is founded. If I can understand them, they are opposed to every principle for which the Liberal Party has ever contended. I come, then, to the conclusion of the noble Lord, that the verdict of the country upon our scheme is irreversible; but he accompanied it with a qualification which considerably relieved my mind—"until it is appealed against." Why, obviously every verdict is irreversible until it is appealed against; but it is against that verdict that we intend and shall continue to appeal. Not for the details of that scheme which we propounded, but for the principle of it, do I contend. That principle is to restore social order to Ireland by giving to Ireland the form of government which will secure the loyalty, the affection, and the obedience of the Queen's Irish subjects, and it is the only principle through which social order can be restored. With reference to the Land Question, until we see the proposals of the Government, it is impossible to say anything more definitely, except to point out the danger and unwisdom of delaying any attempt to settle it. With reference to local self-government, I am bound to say that I think the principle of the scheme of the Government, whose notion of forcing upon Ireland what they dare not force upon Scotland—identity of institutions—is likewise most unstatesmanlike. Our scheme has been condemned before it was tried; if the scheme of the Government is tried, it will be condemned because it was founded upon a great error of fundamental principle and because in the method in which it was attempted to be applied it was altogether inapplicable and impracticable.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) said, he claimed the attention of the House while, as a Belfast Representative, he made a reply to observations directed to the state of affairs in that town. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced yesterday that Her Majesty Government were prepared to appoint a Commission to conduct a solemn and impartial inquiry, taking the evidence of reluctant witnesses on oath, in order that the state of Belfast and the origin of the lamentable riots that had saddened the hearts of the citizens might be thoroughly investigated; and he (Mr. Johnston) had no fear as to the results of such an inquiry. Notwithstanding this promised inquiry, the hon. Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) last night had introduced a sectarian view and opinion into his observations on the subject, and the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had followed that up by an accusation against a most loyal Organization, to which he (Mr. Johnston) had the honour to belong. The real commencement of the riots at Belfast, on June 4, was an attack on a Protestant workman, who was told in emphatic terms by his Roman Catholic fellow-labourers that when the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman, then Prime Minister, was passed, not a Protestant would be allowed to earn his living in Ireland. On the 7th of June, thank God, that Bill was rejected by Parliament. On the 8th of June a Presbyterian congregation, meeting in Albert Street Church, situated within that part of Belfast the hon. Member for South Sligo (Mr. Sexton) claims to represent, was attacked by a Roman Catholic mob. The windows of their place of worship were broken, and from that day to this that congregation had not been able to offer to God in their own church the services of their religion. This was the origin of the disturbances in Belfast. He had no doubt that in the investigation which was about to be instituted, and which he was sure would be conducted with impartiality and ability, the true facts of the case would be brought out as he had stated them to the House of Commons. The Rev. Mr. Montgomery, the pastor of the congregation—no partizan nor member of the Orange Society—had had to complain to the Constabulary of Belfast that he was not protected in the religious observances within his own church. His congregation was attacked Sunday after Sunday, when going to their place of worship. Youths going to prepare for the Communion of the Presbyterian Church were assaulted, and one seriously injured. On the 15th of August—a day which was known in Ireland as Lady Day, and which was sometimes devoted to the services of religion, and sometimes to riot—the Rev. Mr. Montgomery had to leave his own church and worship in the Ulster Hall—a place not usually devoted to religious services, but where congregations driven from their own place of worship sometimes found a refuge. Again, the Rev. Dr. Hanna, of St. Enoch's Presbyterian Church, organized a Sunday-school excursion for the children and members of his congregation. It was usual for such excursions to be accompanied by bands of music and banners bearing texts of Scripture. That there might be no excuse given for disturbance by the assembling of the young people, they were desired to break up into parties and retire to their homes unaccompanied by the usual musical demonstration. Unfortunately, one band did not observe these regulations, and met with rough treatment. Bands played without molestation on the Sabbath Day in Dublin and Cork and elsewhere in Ireland; but a band could not go through the streets of Belfast accompanying a Sunday-school excursion, without the sensitive feelings of the defeated Home Rule Party being excited into such a state that they became a riotous mob. He (Mr. Johnston) had listened that day with interest to the Question of the hon. Member for South Sligo, as to whether the noble Lord proposed that the inquiry about to be held should embrace the aims and objects of the Orange Society. As one of the oldest officials of that Society, he unhesitatingly said that they challenged the most thorough and complete investigation into their aims and objects. The books of the Society were at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government, and the whole Organization, from its inception to its present position, was ready to be submitted to the most entire and impartial scrutiny. Accusations had been made against the Orange Society, and statements had been made in the House of Commons, that were completely without foundation, and it was believed that by the constant reiteration of coloured and heated statements the average Englishman would be induced by-and-bye to credit them. Slanders repeated time after time, and possibly not contradicted, were calculated to do irreparable injury to a loyal body of men in Ireland. In connection with the subject, he would relate to the House a personal reminiscence on the feelings that existed in the city. On July 13th there was the laying of the foundation stone of an Orange hall in Belfast. On that occasion he had the opportunity of disagreeably finding out what the feelings of some of the people were. Returning from the laying of the stone, he carried in his hands a couple of sashes, rolled up in a manner not calculated to give offence to even the most fastidious hon. Gentleman opposite. When descending from a tramcar the sashes were snatched out of his hand. He requested the magistrate before whom the case came to deal leniently with the unfortunate offender; but the man was sent to gaol for a month for the assault. If the co-religionists of hon. Gentlemen opposite could not bear to see an Orange sash, and attacked a person carrying it, was it to be wondered at that Protestant feeling was sometimes aroused, and that there was an attempt made to defend Protestants from outrage and wrong? He would ask the pardon of the House for alluding to this personal matter. He had done so simply to illustrate the position of affairs in Belfast. Then there were the riots arising after the 31st of July. They heard from the Chancellor of the Exchequer yesterday an appalling account of the number of deaths, of the number of persons who suffered serious injury in those riots. It had been said that the riots were Orange riots. Would the House be surprised to hear that out of the 200 wounded only about 10 per cent were members of the Roman Catholic Party? The noble Lord, in his character of Leader of the Government in this House, probably was right in defending the character and position of the Royal Irish Constabulary; but he (Mr. Johnston) asserted, and it would be proved at the investigation, that the Royal Irish Constabulary were severely disturbed by the Home Rule measures introduced by the late Government. The Constabulary believed they were about to be handed over in a new *régime* to other parties, and they came down, as would be proved from the statements upon oath of some of them, determined to make an attack upon the Protestants of Belfast, to the injury of the reputation of that loyal town. He was jealous of the reputation of Belfast, for while other portions of Ireland were in poverty and wretchedness, in riot and rebellion, Belfast was loyal and true to the British Empire. He declared his conviction that a conspiracy was entered into to degrade Belfast in the estimation of the Empire and the inhabitants of the civilized world. Some of its citizens had been provoked, and outrage and wrong had been done; the Constabulary, in many instances, breaking loose from their officers, and, disobeying orders, fired shot after shot upon peaceable and unoffending citizens. A young scholar, going home from Sunday-school, by streets in which he thought he was not likely to be attacked, was singled out and shot dead with the Bible in his hand. Was it to be wondered at that, in these circumstances, the Protestants of Belfast lost confidence in the Constabulary? He had seen a letter from a constable, in which the writer said that, after a certain transaction which took place in the town, he was ashamed to go about in a constable's uniform and look civilians in the face; and he (Mr. Johnston) was informed that on one occasion, when the Royal Irish Constabulary were about to fire on a peaceable crowd of persons, an officer in command of a portion of Her Majesty's troops—a portion of a Highland regiment—told the Constabulary that if they fired in the direction in which it seemed they intended to fire, the troops would fire upon them. There was some justification for the allegation that if there had been wrong done by some in Belfast who bore the name of Protestants, they were not to blame for the origin of the disturbance. If there had been life lost, if innocent persons had died, if murders had been done, those who were the guiltiest persons, and who, if there was an impartial investigation, would assuredly be brought to justice, were not the Protestants or Orangemen of Belfast. If hon. Members opposite had confined themselves to a general discussion as to the policy of Her Majesty's Government, he would not—for it would not have been his duty—have entered into these details; but, under the circumstances, he should not be worthy to represent one of the noblest cities in Her Majesty's Dominions—a city that would yet wipe out the stain that had been sought to be placed upon its escutcheon—if he remained silent in the House of Commons when accusations completely without foundation were levelled against its fair fame and reputation. It was said yesterday by the hon. Member for North Dublin, that instead of the Government consulting with the Mayor of Belfast as to the peace of the city, the Mayor of Belfast ought to be placed upon his trial for the outrages. ["Hear, hear!"] He saw the hon. Member acknowledged the accuracy of the quotation. He (Mr. Johnston) was prepared to defend the Mayor of Belfast from this baseless accusation—an accusation which he was confident the hon. Member would not have made if he had known the high and honourable character of the gentleman whom he misrepresented. Her Majesty's late Government singled out that gentleman for the honour of Knighthood, and it was reserved for the Conservative Government to add to the honour by conferring a Baronetcy upon him. There was, therefore, complete unanimity of opinion between the two sides of the House as to the desirability of conferring honour upon a man who, by his intelligence and his industry, by his position as head of the shipbuilding interest in Belfast, had done more, perhaps, than any other man in Ireland to raise the character and position of the town, and to benefit and develop the industrial resources of Ireland. In conclusion, he would express the hope, earnest and sincere, that the days of riot and outrage in Belfast were over, and he was sure the House would join with him in the earnest prayer that peace and happiness, truth and justice, would prevail for all time to come in the city which he had the honour to represent in the House of Commons.

Mr. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.) said, he hoped the House would consider seriously the policy of eviction which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had encouraged the landlords to carry out next winter. He (Mr. Hayden) had received a mandate from his constituency to protest against any such policy. He had been assured by the people of the district that the consequences of such a policy would be most deplorable, because there could be no doubt it would tend to exasperate the Irish people. Up to recently they had been encouraged to wait for better times. That state of things would be changed, and now they would think that they had nothing to hope for by attempting any longer to meet the unjust demands of the landlords. The demands that were now made upon the tenants for rent were not met by the produce of the land, but by loans from shopkeepers, banks, and by remittances from America. They were told that Irish agitation was supported by the latter. Irish agitation, to his knowledge, had not received during the whole of its existence so much American money as the landlords had in six months, and had not the people been assisted by their hard-working brethren in America, the landlords could not by enforcing any forms of the law have obtained the rents which they had received. If the landlords were encouraged to evict the tenants, did they expect to be able to get rents, or set their land? Would any man in his senses take at the same rent a holding from which the evicted tenant, through no fault of his own, had been unable to make a living? The tenants now were almost reduced to starvation; and if the present weather continued, the position of the unfortunate tenant would be miserable. The Irish Party would not again send round the hat to save the people. It was done by them before, and their Leader said it never could be done again. Some means, however, should be devised to protect the tenant in the crisis which seemed inevitably approaching. The Chancellor of the Exchequer showed his utter ignorance of the real state of Ireland when he encouraged the Irish landlords to a policy of eviction by promising them the aid of the soldiers and the police. To propose that the present state of things should go on until next spring, when the Commission would be appointed, was absurd. Was the suggested guarantee for the purchase-money to be given by Boards, which would be controlled by such Gentlemen as the right hon. and gallant Colonel (Colonel King-Harman), in whom the tenants had no confidence, and who, in proposing the adoption of the Address, showed his characteristic vindictiveness towards the Irish people and the Irish Party, though there was a time when he (Mr. Hayden) stood on the same platform with him advocating Home Rule? This Gentleman was a member of various Local Boards, and were he and his friends to be allowed to pledge the credit of the Irish people in order to get high prices for their estates, and by then, as it was stated they would do, quitting the country, leaving the people who remained behind to bear all the responsibility for the extravagant prices given? If the policy indicated were carried out throughout the winter, did they think it would settle the Irish Question? No; but it would leave a feeling of exasperation, and a desire for retaliation at some future time. Did they not see that such a policy would tend to delay, and render any settlement of the Irish Question far more difficult? He demanded that the voice of Ireland should be considered. No one wished more than the Irish Members to see social order established in Ireland; but when all their efforts to keep down crime were met by the traditional policy of the Tory Party, coercion, it would be their duty, for weal or woe, to stand by the people in doing their duty, and take whatever risks there might be attached to the policy which the Irish people would follow. At the beginning of the year they had hoped that the long standing quarrel between the two countries and two peoples was about to be brought to an end, and that a better feeling had arisen. All such hopes were now shattered for the time. But the Irish people had long memories, and if the Government pursued the policy indicated, its acts would have no authority in Ireland. It was incredible that such a policy could be adopted in the 19th century. It was a brutal policy. It meant that the tenant should have no protection, and that the landlord should have every encouragement to evict. He hoped, in the interests of peace, that even yet better counsels would prevail with the Government, and that that would not be the case; but if it were, the responsibility for the consequences would rest, not with the Irish Members, but with Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) said, he wished to refer to the speech which had been delivered by the hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. Johnston), and to hope also that the peace and prosperity of Belfast would be unimpaired by the late riots. He denied that the aggression in the first instance came from the Catholics. It was accepted all over the Kingdom as a fact that the Catholics, far from provoking the Orangemen, kept strictly within the law; they went to their homes when requested to do so; but the loyal Orangemen were allowed to manifest the strength of their loyalty by shooting down the policemen, by stoning them, and giving them a taste of what they called their "kidneys." As to the Mayor of Belfast, what would be said of an employer who should allow his stores to be plundered day after day, in order that his workmen might arm themselves with nuts and bolts to throw at the police? His workmen, had in fact, been screwed up to fight; and he hoped the Mayor of Belfast would not bolt from the inquiry which was about to be instituted. Passing to the proposed treatment of Ireland by the present Government, he said it was as well that they should see what the real condition of the country was. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the right hon. Gentleman the author of the Land Act had promised that the Act would be a final settlement of the Land Question. But it should be remembered, on the other hand, that, in season and out of season, the Irish Members had told the House that the Bill was faulty and incomplete, and the judicial rents had been described by the Irish Leader as judicial rack-rents. If that was an accurate description of them four years ago, how much more accurate was it now, when that foreign competition, which was only beginning then, had become so acute? He considered that the rents fixed four years ago were 40 per cent over what it was possible for the tenants to pay now—he believed 100 per cent would be nearer it. During the last season, butter had been sold in the Irish market at something like an average of 5*d.* per lb., and a few years ago it used to fetch 1*s.* 5*d.* and 1*s.* 6*d.* As for store cattle, they were bought in the spring of this year at a higher price than could be obtained for them in any market in the Kingdom. It was the same with grain and oats. If butter and store cattle were the only commodities from which the Irish farmer could win his rent, it was impossible for the landlords to expect that their tenants could make it. He would respectfully suggest that there should be an all-round suspension of rent until next spring; the landlords should only be entitled to claim legally 25 per cent of the rent next spring from the farmer, and there should be a concurrent law that there would be a like protection for the landlords from the creditors. If the landlords pushed the tenants to extremities, he did not think he would be acting right if he did not tell the House that the tenants, driven to despair, would be forced to acts of reprisal and resistance, and things would be done which every lover of order in the country would deplore. If the landlords pursued this course, how would the Government benefit them? They would be simply adding more land to that which was already lying on their hands. He said distinctly that the country was almost on the verge of bankruptcy, owing to the reverses of the farmers and foreign competition. Against a policy of eviction the Irish Members would do their utmost, and see that the tenants who suffered had something in their pockets to support themselves and families. There was no finality in the verdict the country had given with respect to Home Rule. In a short time they hoped to have another appeal to the country and to get the verdict reversed. In the meantime, they would do their best to restrain their people; but he was bound to say he should advise his constituents to meet their landlords with a passive resistance until such time as they extorted from them such concessions as would enable them to live on their holdings. Coercion Acts were now out of the question; for the Irish Members would offer continuous and determined opposition to their enactment; and, beyond that, the Irish Members had the support in their demands of three-fourths of the people and of Irishmen throughout the world.

Mr. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.) said, he could not help expressing his surprise and regret that the Speech from the Throne made no reference to the question of Burmah. It was a speech remarkable not so much for what it said as for what it had omitted. Last night the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had informed the House that everything that had happened in Burmah had been quite according to his expectations. He pointed out that it took 10 years to pacify and conquer Lower Burmah, and said that the difficulties of conquering Upper Burmah would not be less than those which had presented themselves in Lower Burmah. He (Mr. Hunter) must say that if that was the opinion of the noble Lord seven months ago, when he was Secretary of State for India, he had succeeded in maintaining a very masterly reticence on the subject. Nothing of the kind was hinted at seven months ago, when the noble Lord congratulated himself and the Government of which he was a Member on the great triumph they had achieved in Burmah. It was a pity that he had given no hint to the authorities in India of the difficulties which they were likely to encounter. The account given of the state of the country by *The Times* Correspondent, whose veracity and accuracy had been proved in connection with the executions in Burmah, was far from encouraging. The effect upon trade had not been what was anticipated. On the contrary, the state of trade in Burmah was very much worse now than it had been before; and, if the noble Lord was right, a long period of expectation must elapse before the Manchester merchant could hope to sell his goods in Upper Burmah. The state of the country was such that the British name was hated, not only among the criminal classes, but among reasonable and law-abiding citizens. The number of troops in the country was at least twice as great as the original estimate. The history of our dealings with that unfortunate country, in fact, was much the same as that of other annexations. First, the cupidity of the British merchant, anxious to secure a fresh market, was excited. Next, the Exeter Hall sentiment was worked up, and we were told what an awful monster King Theebaw was. Then the annexation stage was reached, and we were invited to extend the blessings of civilization. Finally, the Burmese were said to be longing to be rid of their tyrant, and anxious to destroy their own independence. But, until a recent date, the Government of India had strength of mind enough to resist all these importunities. At last, however, the French were brought on the scene, and the Indian Government could no longer resist the forces which were carrying us on to war. The result was the present anarchical state of things, which had been so graphically described by *The Times* Correspondent; but there was no real ground for the fear of French intervention. The French could not have conquered the country, and the French Chamber would never have sanctioned an attempt to do so. ["Oh, oh!"] He held that there was no ground for the fear that Upper Burmah might be conquered by the French. We had a base of operations at Rangoon, and means of communication into the very heart of Upper Burmah, and we had also plenty of Indian troops ready to hand. When we considered how small was the progress which we had made in the last nine months, although we possessed these great advantages, it must be acknowledged that it was ridiculous to suppose that the French, whose base was at Tonquin, could even have approached to the measure of success which we had attained. It was perfectly clear that, at the present moment, the civil administration and the administration of justice in Burmah, as well as the military situation, were of a very unsatisfactory character. The question had been considered by the Indian Government some time ago whether Burmah should be annexed, or whether a Native Prince should be set up under the direction of the British authorities. He could understand that there were many objections to the appointment of a Native Prince; but the adoption of such a plan would remove one enormous difficulty out of our way, since Burmah was one of the few places in which the right divine of Kings was still devoutly recognized, and was a law to the people. If the enormous power which that belief supplied could be utilized to the pacification of Burmah, an inexpensive and bloodless settlement of the difficulty might be expected. If it were the case that we had 30,000 men in Burmah, or anything like that number, it was obvious that the original estimate of the cost of annexation at £300,000 must be very largely exceeded. In view of the arduous work which still lay before us, the cost of the occupation must come to a very large sum; and he trusted the Government would seriously consider the propriety of paying at least a share of that expense from the Exchequer of this country. He hoped they would not add to the other mistakes which they had already committed in connection with this Expedition to Burmah the ineffable meanness of making the poor people of India pay for the opening up of markets for the merchants of Manchester and London. There was one other portion of the Address on which he wished to say a few words. The remarks in the Queen's Speech with reference to the verdict of the country on the Irish Question he did not complain of as being inaccurate; but he thought they might well be considered to be very incomplete. It was quite true that, on the whole, a large majority of Members had been returned opposed to the Irish measures of the late Government; but it was equally true, as well as being a fact of some significance—and he recommended it to those who had hugged to their bosoms the doctrine of finality—that if they measured the verdict of the country by nations and not by votes, there were three nations in favour of Home Rule, while there was only one against it. With reference to Scotland, he thought he could explain—to some extent, at all events—the secret of that opinion. The attachment of Scotland to the Union was above suspicion. With reference to all Imperial matters, for every matter of offence or of defence the people of Scotland did not regard themselves in any other light than as one and the same with the people of England, equally ready and proud to bear their share of the Imperial burdens. But for many years past there had been a growing feeling among the people in Scotland that they failed to get that justice and that attention from the Imperial Parliament which they thought was their due, and to which they were justly entitled. He believed that long before now that feeling would have manifested itself in the form of a demand for Home Rule for Scotland, if it had not been owing to that very strong attachment which they had to the Imperial Union, which made them prefer even the injury of their separate interests rather than any proposal which might involve peril to Imperial unity. But the discussion that had taken place with regard to Ireland had undoubtedly had the effect of educating the minds of many of the electors of Scotland, and he would mention the two principal features in the Irish proposals of the late Government which, in his experience, proved attractive to the Scotch elector. In the first place, the principle of the Bill that there should be a Legislative Assembly, having authority over all matters exclusively and specifically Irish, the electors said was exactly what they wanted for Scotland, with the substitution of the word "Scotland" for "Ireland." To restrict the Imperial Parliament to strictly Imperial Business, and to have a National Assembly which would have the exclusive control of Scotch affairs, seemed to them to be the precise remedy for which they had been so long in search, reconciling their separate interests as a nation with the unity of the Empire. In their view, national autonomy was not opposed to Imperial unity. On the contrary, national autonomy, in the present state of circumstances, was the only foundation on which Imperial unity could permanently repose. There was another feature of the measure which proved very attractive. It would be remembered that, although two Orders were to be established in the National Assembly of Ireland, there was no House of Lords invented for the benefit of the Irish people; and he observed that amidst the shower of criticism that assailed the Bill from every quarter, no one ever complained that the Bill was defective because it did not supply them with a House of Lords. That was a feature which eminently recommended a similar Bill to the minds of the Scottish people. They were perfectly willing to resign any right, or share, or interest that they might be supposed to have in that illustrious Assembly; and if the people of England thought they were not capable of managing their own affairs without the assistance of irresponsible and hereditary legislators, the Scotch were quite willing to make them a present of the whole Assembly. And not only that, but they would cheerfully give up the Scotch Peers in addition. What was the present position of Scotland with reference to its own Government? The Government of Scotland was in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Manchester (Mr. A. J. Balfour). Scotland had good reason to dread the consequences of that untoward event. The right hon. Gentleman had the patronage of all the public offices, and of many of the Chairs in the Universities. They had had experience of Tory Governments in Scotland, and they knew that the maxim which governed all their patronage, great or small, was that "No Liberal need apply." To possess Liberal opinions in a country which returned five-sixths of its Members as Liberals was a fatal disqualification in the eyes of a Tory Government. They were a very patient people in Scotland; but the constant observance of maxims of that kind might try their patience too much. The grievances of Scotland were of a somewhat different kind, no doubt, from those of which they had heard so much in the case of Ireland; but they were, none the less, of a serious and practical character. The mischief that had been done to Scotland through its being associated with England in its local legislation was incalculable. He might adduce, as an instance, a subject which held the very highest place in the intelligent appreciation of Scotchmen—he meant the subject of education. There were many deficiencies to be provided for in the educational system of Scotland, which arose simply from the connection of Scotland with England in the matter of education; and he believed that if they had had a Scotch Parliament in 1850 there would have been no arrears to overtake, or any educational deficiencies to provide for. In 1854 the Scottish people desired to remedy this crying evil, and Mr. (now Lord) Moncrieff introduced a Bill into Parliament; but it was rejected by an English majority, though the majority of the Scottish Members were in favour of it. The reason for that was given by Lord Moncrieff, when he said it was rejected because the English people were afraid it would be an example for England. In the following year, he (Mr. Hunter) must do the House the justice to say that they repented of their action, and passed a Bill on the same lines; but it was destroyed in "another place," and the result was that for a period of 18 years tens of thousands of children in Scotland were brought up ignorant of the rudimentary arts of reading and writing, because the English people willed that it should be so. At the present time, even, the interests of Scotland were seriously sacrificed by its connection with England in regard to education. The mechanical system of teaching and examination which prevailed in the elementary schools was a serious evil. In regard to England it might be a necessary evil; but in regard to Scotland it was an unmitigated mischief, and it was wholly unnecessary. It stunted the growth of the pupils' minds, and it lowered the noble profession of teaching to the level of a mechanical trade. Then, again, how disastrous had been the influence of the English majority upon ecclesiastical questions in Scotland. At present he could descry no signs of repentance or amendment on the part of the English Members in regard to their interference in Scotch ecclesiastical questions. No later than last year the hon. and learned Member for the Inverness Burghs (Mr. Finlay) introduced an Ecclesiastical Bill for Scotland. It was in the opinion of many Scotchmen a mean and mischievous attempt to create ecclesiastical squabbles in Scotland, and set two of the leading Presbyterian denominations by the ears. A majority of Scotch Members—36 against 14—also voted against that Bill, but there was a majority of nearly 40 English Members in favour of the Bill; and the Bill would have been carried, in spite of Scotch opinion, if it had not been for a casual majority of Welsh and Irish Members. In this new Parliament they could not hope for the same success by which to neutralize a large majority of English Members, and therefore Ecclesiastical Scotland lay at the present moment helpless at the feet of the hon. and learned Member for the Inverness Burghs and his Tory and Episcopalian allies. In fact, the same thing that happened in regard to education was being repeated in regard to the Church. The English Members were afraid of the example of Scotland, and thus the ecclesiastical peace of Scotland was ruthlessly sacrificed to the interest of the Established Church in England. He would refer to another case, which occurred no later than last Session. He meant the legislation with regard to the crofters. For many years past the grievances of the crofters had been just as great as they were when they invited the attention of Her Majesty's Government; but it was not until some of them began to make their opinions known by resisting the officers of the law that any notice was taken by the Government of those grievances. Even when the Government did move in the matter, the measure they introduced was of the most truncated character and adapted to the taste of the English palate—in fact, he did not believe any Minister would have dared to present such a measure to a Scotch Assembly—and when Amendments were proposed that would have improved the Bill, they were rejected by an English majority, who altogether set aside Scottish opinion. To his mind, the direction of men's thoughts in Scotland was tending to a real, not a sham autonomy, and the suggestion that a Scottish Assembly should consider measures applicable to Scotland, which should afterwards be subject to the veto of an English majority was an idle one, as it would merely be an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. It was felt that when the opinion of Scotland had been ascertained and expressed, it should not be subjected to mutilation by an English Assembly. It had been said that one of the gravest consequences of establishing autonomy in Scotland would be to create a diversity and conflict of law. The answer to that was that Scotland had already her own laws and institutions, and although Scotland had been so closely associated with England for nearly 200 years, yet the assimilation of the Scotch law to the English was just as remote and distant as it was 200 years ago. In a very few years, if they had a Scotch Parliament, Scotland would advance by leaps and bounds. The Scotch people who shrank from no sacrifices in the cause of education would, in a very few years, provide Scotland with the best and most perfect system of education that was to be found in the whole world. Left to themselves, the Scotch people would soon settle their ecclesiastical difficulties; left to themselves, they would soon make progress with temperance legislation; aye, and even the Land Question would not be too hard a nut for a Scotch Assembly to crack. In 10 years, left to themselves, they were capable of making more progress than they could possibly hope to attain in this Parliament in the course of 50 years. But the emancipation of Scotland from the trammels that impeded her intelligence and restricted her progress was to be accomplished, not by weakening, but by strengthening the Imperial Parliament for Imperial purposes. If the work of the Imperial Parliament were confined to strictly Imperial Business, there would be no difficulty in the way of admitting Representatives of the Colonies which might be affiliated one by one. One of the great advantages of the educational process which they had recently undergone had been that it familiarized people with the way autonomy might be reconciled with Imperial unity. Were such a system adopted, the Imperial Parliament would gain in the important article of time, for at present Imperial questions were as much neglected as local and national work. We are always attempting to drive several omnibuses through Temple Bar at the same time. How anomalous and full of danger was the relations of the Imperial Parliament to India. We handed over the Government of India to a bureaucracy of Englishmen, who in India were birds of passage, and who naturally aimed at making as much money as they could, and returning home as quickly as possible. If we had an Imperial Parliament there would be more time than there was now for the discussion of Indian, Colonial, and Foreign, and Military and Naval affairs. This was the direction in which the mind of the people of Scotland was now going. Their attachment to the Union was above suspicion; and they thought they had discovered a process, exemplified in the United States, in Germany, and in our Colonies, whereby the separate interests of Scotland could be thoroughly reconciled with Imperial unity, and whereby the Imperial Parliament could be made a fit instrument for the momentous interests intrusted to its care.

MR. J. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said, he shared the astonishment of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Hunter) at the remarks of the noble Lord the Leader of the House with respect to the annexation of Burmah. It was at first brought before the House as a remarkable triumph of Conservative diplomacy, and as an annexation effected without bloodshed and in an inexpensive manner, and one of which England would have been deprived by the timidity of the Radicals. We now found that in the eyes of those who devised it the undertaking was at the first contemplated as one that it would take many years to carry out, and had turned out to be a costly and difficult enterprize. Coming to the question of Ireland and to Home Rule, it was satisfactory to him to believe that one of the results of the discussions in the late Parliament, and since, must be to give a great impulse in Scotland to the demand for self-government there. He could not see what there was in the demand, whether it was for Ireland, Scotland, Wales, or England itself, other than the carrying out of the principle of democracy, to which we were more and more advancing, of allowing people to manage their own affairs. He objected to the idea of placing those National Governments, which before long would be established, too much under the surveillance and supervision of the Imperial Parliament. The noble Lord the Leader of the House intrenched himself behind the Land Act of 1881, although the Party to which he belonged opposed it; but the Tory Party was generally defending a penultimate state of things. He wondered what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) now thought of the situation, so far as the question of the land was concerned. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman was acting as the lieutenant of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and that both of these right hon. Gentlemen supported, and were much in love with, the present Government. It would appear, therefore, that the purchase of Irish land was only to be condemned when the proposal emanated from the Head of the Liberal Party, and that when it was proposed by the Conservative Party it became an excellent investment. When this became evident to the Liberals throughout the country he believed it would be one of the most potent means of reuniting the Liberal Party, the dissensions in which were the only cause of the Tory Party being in power. The justice of the demand for Home Rule was every day becoming more apparent, and such a tinkering with the question as was proposed by the Government could not prove satisfactory to the people of either this country or Ireland. What was to be the result of the Inquiry of the Commission on this subject? It was said that nothing they did would give rise to legislative interference with rents. It was quite clear the object of inquiry was to be to find out whether the Irish tenant or the English taxpayer was to pay the rents of the landlords in Ireland. The supposition appeared to be that the Act of 1881 was an Act for guaranteeing and securing a certain amount of rent to Irish landlords. On the contrary, it was one for diminishing unjustly high rents. The Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) had spoken a little more clearly than the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and had said——

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, rising, said: Mr. Speaker, I must ask you, Sir, whether there is not a Rule of this House that quotations cannot be made of speeches delivered in the other House of Parliament in the same Session?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a well-established Rule, and one of obvious convenience, that no reference should be made to words used in the other House of Parliament in the same Session.

Mr. J. STUART said, of course, he would at once accept this ruling; but would remark that when the policy of Her Majesty's Government was stated more fully and accurately in the other House by the Prime Minister, and when it was not possible to refer to his language, that showed the inconvenience of having the Prime Minister in the other House. He was astonished to find the Party which at the last Election placarded the walls against any attempt to buy out the Irish landlords now resort to a proposal which was based on a payment to be made out of the money of the British taxpayers. The Tories declaimed very loudly indeed against any Land Purchase scheme. As to the other Irish proposals of the Government, astonishment was expressed that the Irish Members did not readily seize upon them. The Tory Party was always giving to Ireland what Ireland did not want. They were like the lady who said to the nurse—"Go and see what baby is doing, and whatever she is doing tell her not to." The Tories always tried to discover what Ireland did not want, and then they offered it to Ireland. Such a policy could only produce exasperation and contempt. Then, as to local government, it was proposed that it should be similar for the Three Kingdoms. But the form of government should be similar only because the circumstances were similar, and the circumstances of the three countries were entirely dissimilar. In Scotland they did not want the same institutions which suited England, and he doubted whether similar local institutions would suit all parts of England itself. The demand for Home Rule in Ireland was a real, and not a got-up demand. He considered the scheme of the Government fatally defective, and certain to end in failure.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) said, he could only describe the policy of the Government as one of reaction, of antagonism to that of the late Government, and of persecution, procrastination, and empty promises. The policy of procrastination was to be found in the issuing of Royal Commissions to make inquiries; and, indeed, when an attempt was made to realize the object and the scope of the Government policy, it was found to resolve itself into nothing more suggestive than a huge note of interrogation. He asked why all those Commissions that had been mentioned in the speech of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) were to be appointed? They had been told that the Conservatives had no intuitive knowledge. They might be inclined to remark that the Conservative Benches were not noted for knowledge intuitive or otherwise. But surely it was a strange complaint for a Government consisting principally of hereditary legislators to make; for if hereditary legislators had not intuitive knowledge, where should one look for it? In France, political Parties were very fond of labelling their Governments with particular names. They had what was known as a *Gouvernement de combat;* but our present Government might fitly be described in the same nomenclature as a *Gouvernement de recherche.* They had been told by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) that one of these Commissions was to consist of three highly-scientific gentlemen, though he had not been able to lay his hands upon them yet. These three gentlemen were to inquire whether by an outlay of public money, and upon what reasonable terms, the material resources of Ireland could be developed, the energies of the people directed, and capital attracted into the country. The first remark upon that would be that, for a purpose such as that, no inquiry was necessary. They were all perfectly well aware that whenever money could be obtained for enterprizes of any kind in Ireland, or elsewhere, results followed that developed the material resources of the country, and provided an outlet for the energies of the people; but there was this distinction—public moneys when granted in the form of pauper charity, which loans at an unbusinesslike rate of interest seemed to be, had a demoralizing effect upon the country to which those loans were made. Rather let the people of the country themselves find an outlet for their energies under a form of free self-government such as the Irish demanded. We in this country would consider the subject a good many times before we went and begged loans as a sort of charity from some foreign country to develop our resources, and the Irish people had a right to say to us—"Give us power, by our own self-governing institutions, to get what we want in the way of capital, and you will see how great will be the advantages both to our country and to yours." They wanted capital in the county of Cornwall to develop its mineral industry. If the development of the resources and industries of Ireland were to be provided for by the British taxpayer, he wanted to know whether they in this country had not a right to ask for a little of this reproductive capital, which seemed to be so abundant when the Tories were in Office, but so difficult to find when the Liberals were in power? What were they to say when they found hon. Gentlemen, who were supposed to be such resolute opponents of anything like Socialism, coming down to the House, and proclaiming as their fixed and resolute policy a course more Socialistic in its tendencies than any suggestions he had ever heard or seen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain)? They were told this scientific Commission was first of all to inquire into the deep sea fisheries; secondly, the railways and tramways; and, thirdly, arterial drainage. He was inclined to describe this Government as something almost identical in character with that of the City Commissioners of Sewers. But with respect to all these matters, about which so many months were to be wasted in idle and futile inquiry, loans were in existence at the present moment for all these purposes. In the last Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland they found that during the year loans amounting to £77,226 were granted for the purpose of arterial drainage; £17,700 for purposes of main drainage; and £165,000 for improving farm houses, labourers' houses, and so forth. Under these circumstances, it was a positive insult to that House to come and pretend to have a new-fangled policy, which turned out to be merely a sham, for the purpose of deluding the public and covering a policy of procrastination. Then they were to have the persecution of friends and enemies alike. They were to have a persecution against the Orangemen—the loyal Orangemen of Belfast—because they had been following a little too literally the advice and sweet counsel of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington. He (Mr. Conybeare) was in the House when the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) delivered that philippic against the constructive treason of the noble Lord. It was going too far, perhaps, to say that treason to-day sat in high places; but it was certainly true that the constructive traitor of last Session was to-day one of Her Majesty's most trusted and confidential Advisers. Then they were to have persecution in other forms. They were to have persecution in the districts of Kerry, because there existed there, perhaps, some "Boycotting." As if there was no "Boycotting" in any other part of the United Kingdom! When the time came, if it did come, he should be prepared to give evidence of "Boycotting" and intimidation and of wholesale ruffianism on the part of noble Lords, Primrose dames, and their followers, which would certainly vie with, if it did not cast into the shade, the "Boycotting" that existed in Kerry. Then there was another form of persecution. That was the wholesale evictions that had taken place already, were taking place, and which would take place during the long and weary months of the coming winter. In three months of the last winter 3,000 or more unfortunate people had been driven out of their homes. He had said, too, that the policy of the Government was a bundle of empty promises to Ireland. They promised to give a great deal to Ireland at the expense of the British taypayer, and this was to be undertaken by a Government of Gentlemen who came into Office, he was going to say, by a fluke, but who had certainly reached their present position through misrepresentations against Her Majesty's late Government. He was not accusing hon. Gentlemen opposite of it. He said they reached their present position by falsehoods and misrepresentations scattered wholesale throughout the country by their supporters. In a remote district of his own constituency the labourers were informed that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had introduced his Land Purchase Bill because he was a great landowner in Ireland, and wished to get rid of his estates there on favourable terms. These Gentlemen had got into

Office by reason of the panic they instilled into the minds of a great portion of the English electorate, and by telling them they would, as the result of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, be saddled with taxation to the extent of £150,000,000, or about £30 a-head all round. One of his (Mr. Conybeare's) Colleagues in Cornwall—the hon. Member for the Truro Division (Mr. Bickford-Smith)—stated that himself; and he (Mr. Conybeare) dared say the hon. Member was only a sample of others. And these Gentlemen having won their election by denouncing a scheme which they had never understood thoroughly—they did not understand it thoroughly, or they would have seen it involved no risk whatever to the British taxpayer—these Gentlemen now came to ask them to sanction a policy of handing over untold millions without any security at all. But the scheme of the Government would certainly necessitate the expenditure of many millions of English money. The Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury), a short time ago, had denounced the late Government for attempting to establish an independent Parliament. If the noble Marquess had understood the Bill, he would have known that the Bill would have done nothing of the kind. The Government had suggested a general local government scheme, which he supposed was intended to conciliate those quondam Home Rulers, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Mover of the Address (Colonel King-Harman) and the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Henry Matthews). He should be surprised to find such a plan supported by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), who had abandoned his own plan of a National Council because it lacked the essential element of success—namely, the acceptance of the Irish people themselves. The policy of the Government appeared to be to offer the Irish people alms and inquiries for which there was no need, but to deny them the one thing that they asked for, and which men holding Radical views must desire to see granted. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the Government were in a very peculiar position. They could not keep their places upon the Treasury Bench without the assistance of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. The recent Elections, however, had shown how diminished was the political influence of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. He went down to Cardiff to give his aid in the attempt to oust a Member of the late Government; but that hon. Member was returned with a majority greater than before. The right hon. Gentleman wrote letters to his constituents in Cornwall with a view of assisting his Tory opponent; but he was returned by a majority more than treble. The right hon. Gentleman had no doubt shown that he retained some influence in Birmingham, upon which he had imposed as one of its Members a Tory Home Rule Home Secretary. But there were manifest signs that his influence outside of Birmingham was very slight. The country could not understand the consistency of those who, having emphatically condemned the Purchase Bill of the late Government, and declared that they would be no party to placing a financial burden on the British taxpayer for such a purpose, now supported the policy of the Government, which included a Purchase Scheme involving the heaviest burdens upon the taxpayers of this country. The right hon. Gentleman had a Land Purchase Scheme of his own, which had been printed and laid before the Cabinet, and the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had challenged him to make it public; but the right hon. Member for West Birmingham refused, not unnaturally, since it would have shown that his own scheme was worse than the Purchase Scheme of the late Government in all those points in respect of which he attacked the Ministerial measure. A great deal had been said about the final and irrevocable verdict of the constituencies; but there was no such thing as finality in politics. The Act of Union was considered final; but it was nevertheless altered—and altered in an important particular—when the Irish Church was disestablished. At that time the hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. Johnston) and his friends went about denouncing the Queen.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) said, he had already denied that allegation.

Mr. CONYBEARE said, he was referring to resolutions passed at meetings at which the hon. Gentleman was present.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON: Quote the resolution.

Mr. CONYBEARE said, he had not the exact words; but the resolutions were to the effect that if the Queen gave her assent to the Act for the disestablishment of the Irish Church she would be violating her Coronation Oath. The cardinal feature of the policy of the Government was that evictions were not to be discontinued. There was to be no mercy shown to the unfortunate tenants. What, he wondered, would the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) say to that, who had last Session urged so strongly the passing of a measure to suspend evictions? On the other hand, this was to be said—that the Democracy of Great Britain and the Democracy of Ireland had embraced each other; that they had clasped hands across the silver streak that separated the Sister Islands; and they did not mean to give up the struggle until the principles of freedom and self-government had been established in Ireland—those principles which they were still fighting to establish in their full splendour in this country. That curse to this country, that incubus in the form of hereditary obstruction, which still existed, they meant to fight against shoulder to shoulder with the Democracy of Ireland, for the purpose first of establishing Home Rule there, and then getting rid of the obstructions in the way of the full aspirations of the Democracy of England.

Mr. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.): As the Representative of an almost purely agricultural constituency in Ireland, I think it is desirable that I should add my indignant protest to those already made against the remarks which have been addressed to the House by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have no hesitation in saying that the policy enunciated by the noble Lord was received in Ireland this morning with the most intense indignation. I have no doubt that it is regarded by five-sixths of the population of Ireland as a policy of cowardice and evasion. I believe that the tenantry of Ireland recognize, and that the people of England also should recognize, in that declaration of policy that the landlord's interest is the only interest that is to be considered. If the Government had deliberately set about fashioning a policy which would tend to exasperate the Irish people, they could not have succeeded better. As the Representative of a purely agricultural constituency, I arraign Her Majesty's Ministers to-night of a conspiracy to drive the tenantry of Ireland to revolt, in order to pave the way for coercive measures directed not against the Irish tenantry alone, but against every class of the Irish people. Whether the noble Lord, when he enunciated the policy of the Government last night, intended this I know not; but I tell him that he and the Government which he represents in this House are deliberately embarking upon a course which will as surely exasperate the Irish people as the course pursued by a certain Relative of his, in order to bring about the Union, succeeded in driving their forefathers into open insurrection. It does not deserve the name of a policy; it is a mere pretext for staving off until some distant date the advance of that public opinion which is inevitable in regard to the Irish Question, in order that, in the meanwhile, some scheme may be devised for compensating the landlords for rights which they do not possess. My hon. Friend who addressed the House some time ago (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) described the Government as one of inquiry. I say that it is one of landlord enrichment; and that its so-called policy is a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. It is a mockery to the tenantry of Ireland by promising inquiry as to their case, but permitting—nay, encouraging—their extirpation; meanwhile it is a mockery to the nationality of Ireland by deliberately attempting to cheat it out of its birthright—it is a bribe to the Nationalists, which I say emphatically they spurn and despise; it is a mockery to thousands of English people, who thought that voting in this Government they were simply supporting the Union, and who, although differing as to the means, were ready to support some scheme of self-government for Ireland, but who never contemplated the inauguration of a policy which is destined, if persisted in, to plunge Ireland into bloodshed. Now, Sir, I wish to ask if this was the policy which the people of England, professing Liberal opinions, thought they were voting for when they sent into this House many of the hon. Members sitting on this side who are prepared to maintain the Union? Was that the policy for which the Protestant farmers of South Derry turned out Mr. Healy? Was that the policy for which the electors of South Tyrone voted when they rejected Mr. O'Brien, and put in his place an hon. Gentleman who posed before them as one of the strongest advocates of the interests of the Irish tenants? I cannot help thinking that, on these Benches at any rate, that statement of the noble Lord who leads the Government in this House must be regarded as one of the coldest-hearted policies ever put forth from the Treasury Bench. In almost every sentence there was to be detected a total want of appreciation of the true position of the Irish Question. The noble Lord, speaking of the judicial rents having been fixed for 15 years, spoke of that as a period amply sufficient to make provision for a rise and fall of prices in good and bad years. But have we had any good years since the judicial rents were fixed? If years of plenty had come first, instead of years of scarcity, there might have been some justification for the remarks of the noble Lord. But what has been the fact? I am glad to see the noble Marquess who represents the Rossendale Division of Lancashire (the Marquess of Hartington) in his place; because he, of all others, ought to be able to explain how it is, if the rents have been fairly fixed, that his father, the Duke of Devonshire, has found it necessary to make a reduction of 20 per cent on a certain portion of his estates. If they were fairly fixed in the past, why has the father of the noble Marquess made a deduction of 20 per cent? He was entitled, according to the doctrine of hon. Gentlemen opposite, to receive the rents in full, or to be fairly compensated for any loss he sustained. The truth is, the tenants are utterly unable to pay the present rents, fixed at a period when nobody could have foreseen the present exceptional and continued depression. Upon one section of the hon. Members who sit on this side of the House rests the gravest responsibility for the position in which we now find ourselves—and that is the Liberal Unionists. The people of Ireland still look to them with a feeling of hope; although they have combined against us in the past, we believe, provided their late professions have been sincere, they may not be indisposed yet to save us from a most threatening and disastrous position. I do not at all envy the noble Lord for the light-heartedness with which he pronounced, last night, a policy of coercion for Ireland. He alluded to the county of Kerry. He is going to send down to that county a General with, I presume, a small army to back him. If Kerry wants exceptional treatment, it is because the landlordism in Kerry has been exceptionally bad. The noble Lord quoted certain crimes and outrages which have been committed in Kerry; but he did not tell the House the number of evictions which have taken place in that county. Although he told us the number of people who are under police protection, he did not tell us the number of derelict farms that for miles and miles may be counted by the roadside within the focus of the "Moonlighting" which the noble Lord proposes to put down, and especially in Castleisland. I do not blame Her Majesty's Government for putting down this "Moonlighting." It has received no encouragement from this side of the House, but has been carried on in defiance of our exhortations. Personally, I have on all occasions denounced outrage; the first speech which I ever delivered in public life—that was but a few years ago—for I am not an old Parliamentary hand and I trust the House will overlook, any imperfections on my part—was in opposition to a nominee of the late Governor of Ireland, Earl Spencer, whom I succeeded in defeating, and on that occasion I denounced crime and outrage in every shape and form. I am prepared, still, to pursue the same course; but I maintain that even could I, and my Colleagues on these Benches, speak with the force of ten thousand voices to the tenantry of Ireland, we could not restrain outrage, if the policy enunciated by the noble Lord from the Treasury Bench last night is to be carried out. If you are to carry out a policy of no consideration for the tenants of Ireland, whose inability to pay their rents is fully admitted in the reduction of 20 per cent which has been made by the Duke of Devonshire, then

I warn you that you will have a Kerry in every county in Ireland; and whatever you may think of it now, you will want a General and an army in each. Are the House and the Government prepared to carry out such a policy as that? The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke of the Earl of Kenmare. I should like to show the House what the position of the Earl of Kenmare is. I have no doubt that he is, as the noble Lord described him, an amiable nobleman; but, like many others perhaps equally amiable, he is not master of his own actions. His estate is in no sense his own estate and possession. He is in the hands of certain persons who are known as the Jews of London. His own agent—a gentleman well known to hon. Members on the other side of the House—was obliged to give up the agency of the estate, because he could not get authority from these Jews to make reductions of rent which would enable him "to break the ring," as he said. I observed articles lately, in some of the Tory papers, advising the Government to seek out here and there some admittedly impoverished tenant for the purpose of his being allowed a rent reduction. Possibly a client employed by the patriotic union —who was to be put up to show that the landlords are not so brutal and exacting as is generally represented. But the Government—and I am not sorry for it—have preferred to present their policy in all its naked brutality. From my own knowledge of the present condition of the people of Ireland, I am able to say that their feelings, at this moment, are only kept under by the hopefulness aroused by the good feeling lately evinced towards them by a large proportion of the people of England, Scotland, and Wales, and that, under the circumstances, exasperation and even bloodshed must result if no concession is made to the just demands of those tenants who find themselves unable to pay their rents. Sir, in conclusion, allow me to call attention to the remark contained in the Queen's Speech, as to the recent vote of the constituencies having been final and irrevocable. We, in Ireland, do not accept that as a true statement of the position. On the contrary, we believe that when the people of England know the real facts of the case they will follow their brethren in Scotland and Wales in determining to do justice to Ireland. Consequently, we do not despair of seeing the united voice of Great Britain in favour of giving the Irish people complete control over their own affairs. If there were nothing else to encourage us in the course we have marked out for ourselves that feeling of hopefulness would alone suffice. But we have other reasons, and we know that if, either through intimidation or in consequence of the bribe which is proposed to be offered to us by the noble Lord and his Colleagues, we were to give up our demands now, there are thousands of our countrymen who would be ready to spring at once into our places. We dare not accept the proffered bribe, even if we were willing, and whatever the consequence may be we are prepared to fight the battle to the bitter end.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.): My hon. Friend the Member for the Southern Division of Dublin (Sir Thomas Esmonde) referred to the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer as being a very remarkable speech. Having carefully listened to that speech, and having, since it was reported, perused it carefully in the daily papers, I quite agree with my hon. Friend, and I am not astonished, having regard to the character of that remarkable speech, at the course which the debate has taken this evening. But it is not with the matters that have been referred to by hon. Members representing Irish constituencies, together with the omission of all reference to the Irish Question from Her Majesty's Speech that we, the Irish Members, have alone to deal with. The noble Lord commenced his reference to the Land Question in Ireland with a rebuke to the late Prime Minister. He gave expression to a good deal of regret that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) should have made any reference to the subject of rents. Now, the right hon. Gentleman, to my mind, and I believe to the mind of every unprejudiced person, only made, after all, what was a most reasonable observation. I will quote the words of the noble Lord as they have been reported in the daily papers. The noble Lord said—

> "Then there is that other question to which reference has been made—namely, the payment of rents."

Sir, it does not require half an eye in the head of any man to know that the payment of rents in Ireland at the present time is an absolute impossibility. The House is aware, and painfully aware, of the fact that the prices of all agricultural produce have fallen to an extent which makes it an impossibility to pay the rent upon these holdings as it is at present fixed. I care not whether these rents are preserved by lease or sub-division, or by the tenants having gone into the Land Courts; but what is it that the noble Lord says on the subject? He went on to say—

> "Her Majesty's Government are by no means satisfied that there is any serious reason for any one of these allegations."

That, Sir, is certainly a most extraordinary expression of opinion. In the face of what we see, and in the face of facts which are patent and incontrovertible, I repeat, Sir, that that is a very strange and singular statement indeed. But having regard to the nature of the statement of the noble Lord, it is not, perhaps, unnatural that he should have followed it up by a sentence equally extraordinary. The noble Lord said—

> "Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to admit that the judicial rents fixed by the Commissioners were at any too high a rate. The Government are further of opinion that it is quite possible the fall in the prices of produce—I allude especially to the fall in the staple article of Irish produce, butter—may be due quite as much to careless or defective manufacture, or to adulteration, as to any general depreciation in prices. Then Her Majesty's Government assume, as I think they are bound to assume, that the Commissioners under the Land Act, in fixing judicial rents for so long a period as 15 years, left ample scope for any exceptional fall in prices. . . . . The view the Government take of the present position of the Land Question is, that for all present purposes we take our stand on the Land Act of 1881, which was declared by its authors to be, and accepted by Parliament as, a final settlement of the Land Question. That Act, as supplemented by the Arrears Act of 1882, and as amended by the Land Purchase Act of 1885, Her Majesty's Government regard as a very valid and binding contract, which was made at that time between the State on the one hand and the landlords and tenants of Ireland on the other; and the policy of Her Majesty's Government will be to see that all legal obligations and all legal process arising out of that Act are strictly enforced and perfectly carried out, so far as such action can come within the province of an Executive Government."

That, Sir, illustrates what we have heard, and what is now familiar in our ears about Minnesota and Manitoba, and the remarks of the noble Lord can only produce a painful feeling among the Irish people—a feeling of dread that the alternative rests entirely between destitution and starvation, or the giving up of their homes and emigrating to Minnesota or Manitoba. At the time that a great many of the rents were fixed, the value of agricultural produce was a very fair standpoint to go by. It is a matter pretty familiar to us all now that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), after the Land Act of 1881 was passed, came to the conclusion, after much reflection, and after a good deal of conference with his Colleagues, that to apply that Act properly and to ascertain its value, a number of test cases ought to be selected. The cases which he desired to take as test cases were not those of tenants who were rack-rented, but of tenants whose rents in Ireland stood in pretty fair and favourable contrast to the valuation. But, because the landlords of Ireland believed in their hearts that even these cases would show that the land system as altered by the Land Act of 1881 was unfair, every means and stratagem were resorted to to frustrate the object which the hon. Member for Cork had in view. I need not remind the House of what followed. The hon. Member for Cork was imprisoned, together with other hon. Members of this House; and then the tenant farmers of Ireland, seeing that their Leader, and those whom they looked upon as their guides, were removed from the outside world, and immured in different prisons, swarmed into the Land Courts. I myself was concerned in a number of cases where the tenants made application to have fair rents fixed, and the landlords used every engine and raised every technical point they could to defeat the applications made by the tenants at that time to have fair rents fixed; and, as regards the fixing of those rents, the tenants were cross-examined by counsel employed by the landlords to the fullest possible extent as to what their means were, and what they got for their butter, their corn, and their cattle. It was only after a minute and careful scrutiny into the condition of the tenants, and having regard to the prices and value of produce at the time, that most of the originating notices were filed, and these rents were fixed. Now, Sir, these values are, as has been pointed out by my hon. Friend the Member for East Galway (Mr. Harris), fully 50 per cent lower now than they were at the time that fair rents were fixed for the tenants' holdings. The right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, in what he very reasonably put forward, spoke of the approaching winter season, and compared it relatively with other times. We are rapidly approaching the month of November, which is a very important period in regard to the payment of rents in Ireland, and the circumstances of the harvest form an important element in the ability of the tenants to pay rent. It is not denied that there are good crops in Ireland, but no one can prognosticate the state of the weather; and certainly present appearances enable us to form no sanguine anticipation as to what the result of the harvest will be. That which was favourable and promising a few weeks ago presents a very gloomy aspect now. Much of the crops, as was pointed out by my hon. Friend the Member for East Galway, has been dislodged by the heavy rains; and what promised to be fair crops less than three weeks ago, it is believed, will, when garnered, fail to realize the anticipations that were formed of them. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer regards judicial rent as a very sacred thing, and very binding in its character; and because he and Her Majesty's Government so regard them he can extend no hope that the tenant farmers of Ireland, in the event of their being unable to pay these rents, will have anything to expect from their landlords, but that the landlords will act in the ruthless way they have hitherto been in the habit of acting. We have, unfortunately, been made aware of the fact—and any reader of an Irish newspaper must be similarly aware of it—that at the meetings of the Boards of Guardians most lugubrious references have been made to the number of notices of evictions which have been served. In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, only last week the Sheriff, with an army of policemen, went to the district of Gweedore, and in that district, where, as has been reported in *The Freeman's Journal,* 60 evictions had already been executed, he evicted as many as 80 families more. The Sheriff was accompanied by an armed force of officers, sergeants, and constables to the number of nearly 200, and they were employed solely on that occasion in carrying out these evictions. The descriptions given by the Special Correspondent of *The Freeman's Journal* are sad and painful in the extreme, and I invite the attention of hon. Members opposite to them. They will find the facts there stated most pathetically on account of the simplicity with which they are told; and the recital of those facts may, I trust, lead them to believe that the only way in which the feelings of the people of Ireland can be satisfied is by putting a stop to evictions in the coming winter. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, put forward a few matters, for the purpose, I suppose, of giving the word of promise to the ear. We were told a great deal about Royal Commissions. We have already had experience in Ireland of what these Royal Commissions have achieved. As a general rule, their mission to Ireland has been like that of the army of the King of France—composed of 30,000 men, who "marched up the hill, and then marched down again." The hon. Member for East Galway pointed out, with a certain amount of facetiousness, the action of one Royal Commission of which he had some experience, which went down to inquire into the condition of the Shannon. The Irish people have very little to expect from the operations of these Commissions for the consideration of Irish affairs. There is to be a big Commission and a little Commission. There is an old story told of a certain sapient Professor, whose chambers were infested with rats and mice. He, therefore, procured a cat and a kitten; and as his chambers were not of sufficient capacity to enable these animals to indulge in their rambling propensities, in order to give them freer access he had a large hole cut for the cat and a small one for the kitten. These two Commissions remind me very much of the action of this sapient and erudite gentleman. I consider that there is just as much common sense in the appointment of the Commissions as there was in the action of this learned philosopher. I trust that Her Majesty's Government, having regard to the very grave and serious condition of matters in Ireland, which is staring the people in the face; having regard to the gloomy and dismal aspect which the coming winter appears likely to open out to them, will see the expediency of acting, not in a partizan spirit, and of consulting the interest of the landlord class only, but that they will consider that property has its duties as well as its rights; that the tenant farmers of Ireland have a right to be protected; and that the evictions now hanging as a sword over their heads shall be suspended, so that they may have confidence that in the coming winter they may not be driven from their homes into misery, the workhouse, or the grave.

Mr. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I cannot congratulate Her Majesty's Government on the manner in which they have conducted the debate throughout the evening. They have allowed shot after shot to be poured into their front without attempting a reply. In this respect, indeed, their policy was fairly described by the motto, "*J'y suis: J'y reste,*" for there they have remained stark and silent, and have not endeavoured to repel one of the charges levelled against them, or against their policy, if they have one. The question is, whether they have a policy? They have attempted to propound one; but we consider that it is the very negation of a policy. All they have done has been to propose the appointment of Commission after Commission, until, in contemplating the real position of affairs, we can scarce remember where we are, or where we are to begin. There is one Commission which Her Majesty's Government propose to appoint to which I particularly wish to refer to-night, and that is the one which is to proceed to Belfast to inquire into the outrages and disturbances which have recently occurred there. In reference to that Commission the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "But, speaking generally about Belfast, I believe I am expressing the sentiments of the Chief Secretary and of the entire Government, when I say that we are resolutely determined to restore and to maintain order in Belfast, and to shrink from no responsibility which will enable us to attain that end, and to attain it without delay."

Now, Sir, I should like to ask the noble Lord how he is going to reconcile that statement with the speech which he delivered in this House on the Arms (Ireland) Bill, only in the last Session—namely, May 20, 1886. He is reported to have said then—

> "Hon. Members in that quarter of the House will please understand that I am not desirous of shirking the question. What I said was, that in circumstances such as they apprehended they would be right in resorting to arms. I maintain, and I defy contradiction, that what I have laid down is the Constitutional doctrine accepted in this country ever since the days of the Revolution of 1688."—(3 *Hansard*, [305] 1544.)

This was an allusion to the advice which the noble Lord had given to the people of the North of Ireland to rise in arms, to wave their banners, and to charge with all their chivalry. The noble Lord proceeded to quote Lord Althorp. He said—

> "In 1833 Lord Althorp—a name which will not be received, I think, with derision by hon. Members opposite—declared that if he had to choose between Repeal of the Union and civil war he would choose civil war."—(*Ibid.*)

Further on the noble Lord quoted Sir Robert Peel in the same debate, and he said—

> "Lord Althorp was a great Whig statesman, who exercised an influence over the House of Commons which has never been equalled by anyone previously or since. Sir Robert Peel, in the same debate, declared that in maintaining the Union the Government might have not only to rely on the scaffold, but to drench the plains of Ireland with blood."—(*Ibid.*)

I think the noble Lord can scarcely complain of the manner in which his advice in this respect has been taken. He can but be satisfied that, if the plains of Ireland have not been drenched with blood, at least her towns and cities have flowed with the blood of her people. But the noble Lord was not content with quoting English authorities. He went, indeed, to another authority, and he quoted from an essay written by the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) upon Robespierre. He endeavoured to show, by reference to the Dictator of the French Revolution, that the people of the North of Ireland would be justified in taking up arms against the laws promulgated by the Government of this country. Not only did he resort to Constitutional authorities in this country, but he resorted to the doctrines of the French Jacobins in order to justify the attitude he had assumed in Ireland. He asked—

> "Will hon. Members in any quarter of the House deny that allegiance is conditional? The

allegiance of Ulster is given to this Parliament on condition that it affords to the inhabitants of Ulster protection. ['Hear, hear!' *and* 'No, no!'"] Certainly, that is the condition, and if this Parliament transfers the lives and the liberties of the inhabitants of Ulster to a Body over which this Parliament will have no control, absolutely none, then I hold that no Divine right attaches to such acts of legislation."—(*Ibid.* 1546.)

These are the words of the noble Lord, and I should like to know what their application is to the present state of Ulster? I should like to know what Reference, what advice, and what Instructions will be given to the Commission that is sent to Belfast? I wish to ask the noble Lord whether he and his Government will advise the Commissioners to investigate the causes of the disturbances that have occurred, and if they are to be brought home to those who have fomented those disturbances? If so, all the water of the River Boyne will be insufficient to clear the noble Lord of the responsibility for those outrages. Then there is to be a second Royal Commission to Ireland. It is not named a Commission, but it is in reality a Royal Commission. A great military Commander is to be sent to Kerry. For what purpose? Is it to put down outrage? We scarcely think that it is. Other Commissions have been sent to Ireland, and yet at a time when every possible murderer in Ireland was supposed to be under lock and key the lives of the officers of the law were being plotted against, and a very few days after the announcement of the appointment of the Commission was made in this House the Phœnix Park murders occurred. Will the noble Lord be more successful in putting down murder and outrage now? Is it likely that General Buller will be able to deal with renewed crime and outrage in Kerry? Is it probable that he will be able to put his hands upon those who may be plotting crime and outrage in Kerry? We, who have had a large experience of the country, know that such has not been the case in the past. It is much more likely that the Forces under the command of General Buller will be employed to collect the rents of that great and good landlord who was referred to in this House the other night—the Earl of Kenmare. That is our experience, and we believe that all the power at the bestowal of General Buller will be exercised to enable the Executive Authority to collect the rack rents of the Earl of Kenmare, and enable the Executive to carry out the policy of the Government which they have enunciated from these Benches—namely, that the rents must be paid, no matter whether they are just or not. That is the second Commission; but there is a third. The third Commission is to be upon trade. We hold that such a Commission, under existing circumstances, can only result in a farce. Any proposition made by the Government will be utterly ineffectual until they are prepared to carry out the policy which was initiated by Lord Carnarvon, or, at any rate, referred to by him, but which was held to be impossible—namely, the protection of Irish trade and manufactures. Irish trade and manufactures were suppressed in the past; and no Commission you can issue and send to Ireland, no Instructions you can give them, will enable them to come back to this country and report to this House that it is necessary to abandon the cherished principles of Free Trade and revert to that policy of Protection which you cast aside years ago. Well, Sir, a fourth Commission is to be issued also. That Commission is to investigate the question of the land; and this, perhaps, is the most significant Commission of the whole. What will this country now think of the present proposals of the Government, whose friends raised such an outcry against Her Majesty's late Advisers for having proposed to buy out the Irish landlords on good security—on the security of the good character of the Irish people, on the security of the Irish land, and the security of a National Government? What will be thought of a Government that now proposes to adopt the principle that they condemned then, and a principle which will not have the security in its favour which was offered by the late Government? What will the people of England, who have been deceived by the representations of the Government, think when they find that the credit of the English nation is to be pledged to purchase out the Irish landlords without having the security of the Irish land, or of the Irish people, or of a National Government? It has been asked this evening, what will the Unionist Party say to that proposal, and what will the Protestants say to the proposals of Her

Majesty's Government? I have very lately visited many districts in England where, during the General Election, this subject was thoroughly threshed out and discussed by both sides who were contending for power, and I know the misrepresentations that were put forth broadcast all over the land on that occasion in order to deceive the people of England as to the true issue. I believe that when the scales are taken from their eyes, whenever they are consulted again they will remember the misrepresentations of the past, and place them side by side with the present proposals of Her Majesty's Government. Her Majesty's Advisers also hold out to the Irish people a hope that great public works will be entered upon in Ireland, and that money will be spent in order to assist the people in tiding over their difficulties, in improving the resources of the country, and in bringing their products to the market at a rapid rate. We hold that these objects would have been the proper business of a central Irish Government in Dublin; and it is a business for the development of which we require the aid and assistance of every Irishman in Ireland. That would have been the duty of the National Government, and of the Representatives of Ireland sitting in Dublin, who would not have been hampered by English legislation, and who would have known how to develop the resources of their own country. They would have known the difficulties against which they would have to contend, and they would be more likely to legislate in a right direction than the Parliament of Great Britain, which cannot be said to have the same special knowledge as that which would be possessed by Irishmen sitting in Dublin. Well, Sir, it is well to tell the Government and Parliament that they ought not to deceive themselves as to the issue of this controversy. The Government may hope to stave off the consideration of the Irish Question for a time, in the hope that the Irish people, tired of the struggle, will lay aside their claims. An hon. Member from these Benches to-night told us that the Irish Sea, only a short time ago, looked like a mere silver streak; that the democracies of England and Ireland had joined hands over that silver streak; but I am afraid that the Government are now going to convert it for Ireland, and perhaps for England, into a melancholy ocean. We have, at the present moment, the attention of the Irish people all over the world concentrated on the manner in which this struggle is to proceed. We have the support of our brethren scattered all over the world. We have the support of the English Democracy. We have the support of the able Government who occupied the Treasury Bench a short time ago. We have all these aids at our back now, and are we going to give up the struggle? No, Sir. We shall proceed until it is brought to a final issue, and I believe that will be before long. We have faith that the English Democracy who have taken up this question will not allow it to drop; and certainly the Irish people will never turn their back upon it until it has been carried to a final and successful termination.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Representing, as I do, also an important Irish agricultural constituency, I feel bound to express my strong sense of the disappointment which must have been felt by the people of Ireland when they read the observations of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer in supporting the Address in reply to the Speech of Her Majesty. If we could not have expected that the Government would, after their recent declarations of policy at the polls, have addressed themselves to the question of Home Rule and of local government in Ireland in a large and wide sense, we might have expected that they would have taken into serious consideration the present alarming condition of the tenantry of Ireland. In addition to a feeling of disappointment, there will be a feeling of keen resentment among the Irish people at the almost trivial tones in which the noble Lord spoke of the serious agricultural position of the country. The noble Lord, in the observations which he addressed to the House yesterday, said—

> "With regard to the Land Question in Ireland, the Government are aware that various allegations are being put forward with great vigour and great assurance from many quarters as to the condition of the Irish Land Question. We are informed, or we hear it said, that judicial rents under the Land Act were fixed at a great deal too high a rate, even if they had not been fixed too high; and we also hear it alleged that the fall in the price of produce has rendered tenants unable to pay those judicial rents, and we are told that there is now, or will soon be,

a general failure to pay rent in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government are by no means satisfied that there is any serious reason for any one of these allegations."

Are Her Majesty's Advisers in a position, or would any Government be in a position, to stay a fall in the price of agricultural produce? Are they in a position to regulate the supply and demand which fix the prices on all the various articles of consumption? If they are not, how can the noble Lord support a statement of this character? We traverse every statement he makes. We say that the judicial rents were fixed too high all along the line, and that the various Sub-Commissioners appointed to carry out the Act did not carry it out in the spirit and with the intentions of its framers. I find, from a Return made in 1884, that the average reductions made by the Commissioners were, in Ulster, 20 per cent; in Leinster, 17 per cent; in Connaught, 20 per cent; and in Munster, 18 per cent. And, Sir, at that time, not only the tenants' advocates, but persons interested in agriculture all over the country, remonstrated, and stated that the Land Act was being maladministered to the tenants' wrong. But if the reductions were inadequate in 1884, when prices were comparatively high, how must it have been in 1885, when prices had sunk much lower? I find, from a Return given in connection with 34 places in the county of Kerry, that in August, 1885, the reductions amounted to 15 per cent; and, later still, only a few months ago, in 17 appeal cases at Bantry, the reductions amounted to 14 per cent upon notoriously rack-rented tenants. It is well known that the constitution of the Sub-Courts was objected to at the time by the tenants' advocates and by the Irish Party. That the Land Act of 1881 was not likely to be satisfactory to the Irish Party is proved by the fact that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his Colleagues refused to support the second reading of the Bill, because they looked upon it as inadequate to meet the circumstances of the case. That was the case with regard to last year and the present year. Last year the prices fell in a most alarming degree; but this year, notwithstanding the noble Lord's statement to the House last night, it can be proved from various Returns—Market Returns, Returns of Fairs, and Returns from other sources which were easily accessible to Her Majesty's Government—that the fall of prices has not only been serious, but is still continuing, and makes it practically impossible for the tenant farmers of Ireland at the present time to pay their full rents. We often hear a great deal, not alone in this House, but in other places, of the repudiation of contracts. We deny in the most emphatic manner that there exists in Ireland any desire—at any rate, any widespread desire—not to pay rents, but a determination not to pay unjust rents. The judicial rents that were looked upon as unfair and as rack rents in 1884 certainly deserve to be placed in that category now. They have become even impossible rents. There exists in no part of Ireland an indisposition to pay rent; but there is a strong determination not to pay impossible rents, and there is a strong objection to be coerced into the payment of these impossible rents. Will any Member of Her Majesty's Government claim that in 1884 rents were not equally as well paid in Ireland as they were in England? Will any Member of Her Majesty's Government, or any man of acknowledged authority in the country, maintain that the reductions voluntarily given by English landlords have not been larger than the reductions enforced by law under the action of the Land Commission? The noble Lord spoke very flippantly of the fall of prices. He seems to cast a doubt on the fall in prices; and he made a reference to the butter question. Is the noble Lord aware that the fall in the price of butter has been most serious, and that it has been the largest ever since the improvement in the make of Irish butter has been the most marked? Up to 1884 there were complaints as to the make of Irish butter; but within the last three years the make of Irish butter has so greatly improved as to be the subject of widespread and general remark, and to be well known to the trade. But, strange to say, notwithstanding the improvement, the price of Irish butter has fallen, 40, 50, and, in some cases, 60 per cent. Is the noble Lord justified in indulging a sneer at the unskilfulness displayed in the manufacture of Irish butter, and its alleged adulteration? Ought he not to have found the explanation in that which is evident to every unbiassed mind—every mind that does not wish to make out a case altogether apart from the merits of the question? Ought not the noble Lord to recognize fairly and honestly that the fall in the price of Irish butter, and the fall in the price of every other article of Irish produce, is entirely owing to the increased and growing importation of all these articles? Where has the noble Lord sought for his proofs? Has he sought for them in some private museum, or in the agricultural bureau of Dublin Castle, or in the public journals? With the permission of the House I will compare some of the prices, and I think they will prove to demonstration the fact that the fall in prices is so alarming that it is utterly impossible for the tenants to pay the judicial rents that have been fixed. The price in 1882 of three-year-old cattle has fallen from £14 to £10 in the present year, or a reduction of 30 per cent. If the noble Lord or any Member of the Government doubts these facts, let him go to *Thom's Almanack*, or any other official authority, and he will find the figures I am about to give fully corroborated. The price of two-year-old cattle has fallen from £12 to £7—a reduction of 42 per cent; of yearlings, from £8 to £3, or a reduction of from 60 to 63 per cent; of "weanlings," from £5 to £1 10*s*., or a reduction of 70 per cent; and the same in regard to sheep in store. In all these items the reductions have averaged from 50 to 55, and even 60 per cent. The noble Lord has referred specifically to butter; and it is strange to say that in the highest qualities, about which there is no question, the average reduction of price from 1882 to the present time is 35 per cent, and in the lower qualities 40 per cent. I need not weary the House by going further into these figures, which all hon. Members can find for themselves; and if they look into those figures, with a serious resolve to ascertain the true state of things, they will discover the actual extent of the agricultural depression which has swept over our country. We refer them to official public documents—to those sources of information upon which their Advisers and officials in Dublin can well be able to lay their hands in a moment. The noble Lord, in the concluding portion of his observations last evening, made reference to another not uninteresting portion of the question when he spoke of the development of the material resources of Ireland. It appears that we are to have a large Commission on the Land Question, and a small Commission of scientifically-minded men to inquire into this question of the material resources of the country. Can it be possible that the Imperial Government of the present day have not sufficient information as to these resources and the means of developing them? Is it possible that enough has not been said during the past half century to enlighten the mind of any Government that is capable of receiving enlightenment? Why, I can venture to say that a small volume recently issued, the work of one of the highest authorities in Ireland, will give Her Majesty's Government, if they are so minded, as much information as any Commission which they can appoint, no matter how long that Commission may investigate—I refer to the work of Professor Sullivan. But we are told that the only way in which the resources of the country can be developed is by the appointment of a Commission—not by acting on the advice of representative men who take an interest in the facts and are prepared to give all their mental powers to the development of the resources of the country in a purely practical way. Sir, we find great fault with the terms of the Queen's Speech, because of its omissions. We find still graver fault with the speech of the noble Lord, because of that which it contains. We tell the noble Lord and we tell Her Majesty's Government that if they seek to aid the landlords of Ireland in a crusade for the recovery of full rent they seek to perform an impossibility; that they will bring sorrow and misery on a land which has already suffered enough; that they will confiscate the tenants' improvements in thousands of cases, and that in seeking to give the landlord more than his rights they will deprive the tenants of all they have. Are they prepared to face that state of things? It will be better for them to take counsel, and follow a nobler and more statesmanlike course than adopt repressive measures, which will be the natural result of their programme.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

——o——

RIVERS POLLUTION (RIVER LEA).

MOTION FOR RE-APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Select Committee of the last Parliament 'to inquire into and report upon the condition of the River Lea, and to make such recommendations as may appear necessary,' be re-appointed."—(*Sir Charles Russell.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I hope the hon. and learned Gentleman will not press this Motion now. I venture to suggest that the hon. and learned Gentleman will find his purpose as well served if he is satisfied with a pledge from the Government that all possible facilities shall be given on the earliest day next Session for the re-appointment of the Committee. It is hardly possible that the Committee could make serious progress with the work before next Session.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.): I am quite satisfied with the statement of the noble Lord, and ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

TOWN HOLDINGS.

MOTION FOR RE-APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I hope the noble Lord will assent to the re-appointment of the Committee, in which I am interested, with regard to town holdings. The Members of that Committee were selected from all parts of the House, and we sat for about six weeks. Now, I think, if the noble Lord will assent to the Motion I am about to make, the Committee would be able to go to Business in three or four weeks, and, therefore, I hope he will not oppose it.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Select Committee of last Parliament be re-appointed to inquire into the terms of occupation and the compensation for improvements possessed by the occupiers of town houses and holdings in Great Britain and Ireland; and to inquire into the expediency of giving to leaseholders facilities for the purchase of the fee simple of their property; and also into the question of imposing a direct assessment on the owners of ground rents, and on the owners of increased values imparted to land by building operations, or other improvements."—(*Colonel Nolan.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Sir, I very much regret that it is not in my power to meet the views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. I stated, on a former occasion, that, after careful consideration of all the Motions on the Paper, Her Majesty's Government had come to the conclusion that they could make no distinction whatever, and that they would put a Notice of opposition on the Paper with regard to any Motion which should come forward this evening or afterwards during the present Session. This is a general rule from which it is impossible Her Majesty's Government can depart; and, therefore, I cannot for myself, or on the part of my Colleagues, agree to the nomination of the Committee at this period of the year.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I should like to appeal to the noble Lord in this matter. It is all very well to have a rule of the kind he has stated; but I venture to think that this Motion does not stand on the same footing as the Motions for the Second Reading of Bills. The appointment of this Committee is a serious matter; and therefore, having regard to the small amount of progress made, the importance of the subject, and the fact that we shall be able to get to work at an early date, I trust the noble Lord will assent to the Motion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman.

COLONEL NOLAN: I am willing to withdraw my Motion, after the reply of the noble Lord.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till *Monday* next.—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Luke Hayden, Bill to amend the Law relating to the election and constitution of Boards of Guardians of the poor in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Luke Hayden, Mr. E. Harrington, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Sheehy, and Mr. Connolly.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 1.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Nolan, Bill to regulate and extend the Liability of Employers in respect of injuries sustained by workmen in their employment, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Nolan, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Arthur O'Connor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 2.]

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John O'Connor, Bill to improve the position of National School Teachers in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Conway, Mr. Joseph Nolan, and Mr. Sheehy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 3.]

MINING ROYALTIES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill for the Regulation of Mining Royalties in the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. Clancy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 4.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mahony, Bill to amend the Law of Registration in Parliamentary and other Elections in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mahony, Mr. Chance, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Peter M'Donald, and Mr. Carew.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 5.]

SITES FOR CHURCHES, &C. (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Mayne, Bill to provide for Sites for Churches, Schools, and Teachers' Residences in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Mayne, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, and Mr. Crilly.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 6.]

PRIVATE LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Corbet, Bill to alter and amend the Law relating to Private Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, and to make other and more suitable provision for paying patients, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, and Mr. Molloy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 7.]

RETURNING OFFICERS' EXPENSES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Picton, Bill to provide for the payment of the Expenses of Returning Officers at Parliamentary Elections out of local rates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Picton, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Caine, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. Burt, and Mr. James Stuart.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 8.]

BANKRUPTCY COURT (BELFAST) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sexton, Bill to establish a Local Court of Bankruptcy in Belfast, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sexton, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. Biggar, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, and Mr. Carew.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 9.]

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Peter M'Donald, Bill to amend the Law relating to Bankruptcy and Bankruptcy arrangements in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary), and Mr. M'Cartan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 10.]

ARBITRATION COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mason, Bill to enable the Board of Supervision in Scotland to appoint Courts of Arbitration to adjudicate on cases of disputed settlements, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mason, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, and Mr. Watt.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 11.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (CORNWALL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Borlase, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays in Cornwall, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Acland, Mr. Conybeare, Mr.Courtney, and Mr. Bickford-Smith.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 12.]

BUTTER SUBSTITUTES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Laws relating to the trade in Butter Substitutes in the United Kingdom.

Resolution *reported:*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Lalor, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary), Mr. Hooper, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Biggar, and Dr. Tanner.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 13.]

HIGH SHERIFF (DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL) (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Bill to remove the disqualification of holders of retail spirit licences in Ireland from filling the office of High Sheriff, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Cox, and Mr. Richard Power.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 14.]

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Bill to amend "The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1872," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Arthur O'Connor and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 15.]

SOLICITORS' ANNUAL CERTIFICATE DUTY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Hea, Bill to repeal the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Deasy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, and Mr. Arthur O'Connor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 16.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Burt, Bill to amend "The Employers' Liability Act, 1880," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, and Mr. Lockwood.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 17.]

MINERS' WAGES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill to amend the Law relating to the payment of Wages of Miners, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Clancy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 18.]

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 23rd *August*, 1886.

MINUTES.]—New Members Sworn—Ronald Craufurd Munro Ferguson, esquire, *for* Leith Burghs; Sydney Evershed, esquire, *for* Stafford County (Burton Division).

Select Committee—Ventilation of the House; Printing, *nominated.*

Public Bills—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading*—Linen (Ireland) * [24].

Ordered—First Reading — Beer Adulteration * [19]; Divorce (Law of Evidence Amendment) * [20]; Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) * [21]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment * [22]; Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses) * [23]; Railway Freights * [25]; Evictions (Ireland) * [26]; Parliamentary Elections Expenses (Ireland) * [27]; Belfast Government * [28]; County Government (Ireland) * [29]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) * [30]; Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment * [31]; Municipal Franchise (Ireland) * [32]; University Education (Ireland) * [33]; Allotments and Small Holdings * [34].

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—THE TITHE WAR IN WALES.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD (London): I beg to give Notice that on Thursday next I shall ask the Home Secretary, Whether his attention has been called to an article in *The Daily News* of the 23rd of August, entitled *The Tithe War in Wales?*

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I rise to Order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! As I understand, the right hon. Gentleman is now giving Notice of a Question. According to the Rule of the House made last Session, the right hon. Gentleman must give Notice of the Question to the Clerk at the Table in the usual way.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD: I beg your pardon, Sir.

QUESTIONS.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) — DREDGING FOR MUSSELS IN DORNOCH FIRTH.

Mr. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to the conviction of several Lossiemouth fishermen on June 18th, at Tain, for dredging for mussels to be used as bait in the exercise of their calling, such dredging being below low water mark in the Dornoch Firth; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will propose any legislation on the subject and also recommend that the penalties inflicted be remitted?

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I have ascertained that this case is at present under appeal; and therefore it would be quite improper that any answer should be made to the Question at present.

NAVY — ORDNANCE — THE "COLLINGWOOD" 42-TON GUN.

Sir HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Committee to whom the question of the failure of the *Collingwood* 42-ton gun was referred; or whether he can state generally the conclusions of the Committee as to the cause of the failure of that gun?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said, the Report had just been received, and would be laid before Parliament as soon as possible.

ARMY—COMMISSIONS IN THE ROYAL ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, To state the numbers of Commissions that have been conferred during 1885 and 1886 in the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers over the heads of the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, on gentlemen not required to pass through the Royal Military Academy, with the dates of their Commissions respectively; also to state the cases in which the gentlemen so appointed were or were not required to pass examinations; and, whether they had the advantage of any military training such as is received at the Royal Military Academy?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In 1885 seven direct commissions were conferred in the Royal Artillery, and 11 in the Royal Engineers; in 1886, 20 in the Royal Artillery and 29 in the Royal Engineers. The information asked for by the hon. Member cannot well be given within the limits of an Answer to a Question; but I shall be happy to furnish him with it privately, or it can be given in the form of a Return if he will move for it.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—FISHING BOATS ACTS AMENDMENT—LEGISLATION.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to re-introduce the Merchant Shipping Fishing Boats Acts Amendment Bill which passed through this House last Session?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): In reply to the hon. Member, I can only say that it is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose any legislation of a general character during this Session.

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID (St. Pancras, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, considering the grave charges brought against the Ordnance Department by Lieutenant Colonel Hope, V.C., and others, and considering the failures which have occurred in the supply of War Material to the Army and Navy, he proposes to appoint a Royal Commission or a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry, or what other course he proposes to adopt to satisfy the public mind?

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to institute any judicial inquiry, by means of a Royal Commission or otherwise, into the charges brought by Colonel Hope and others against the Ordnance Department?

MR. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Secretary of State for War, What course the Government intends to take with reference to the charges made against the Ordnance Department by Lieutenant Colonel Hope and others?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the Question of the hon. Baronet, and also in answer to the Questions of the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee, who were kind enough to postpone their Questions until to-day, I have to say that I have carefully considered the charges that have been made; and, so far as I know, none of them have yet taken the form of a specific charge of corruption, of malversation, or of disgraceful conduct on the part of any particular officer or officers; and I have therefore only to invite that which Colonel Hope himself invited in a letter which appeared in *The Daily News* of Saturday—confidential communications to me of any facts imputing corruption against any individual officer of the Ordnance Department, or in other Departments of the War Office. If any such facts are communicated to me confidentially, I will undertake to consult with the Lord Chancellor and the Law Officers of the Crown; and if these facts constitute, in their judgment and mine, a *primâ facie* case for submission to any tribunal competent to take judicial cognizance of such charges, they shall be submitted to such tribunal; and if no tribunal exists that is competent to take cognizance of such charges I will undertake, on the part of the Government, that a judicial tribunal shall be found to deal with them.

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS—REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID (St. Pancras, N.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been called to a petition from the Civil Service Writers, which was presented to the Treasury about twelve months ago, and upon which a Departmental Committee was appointed to report; and, whether he can inform the House when that Report will be made, and when a determination may be arrived at upon a claim which was stated by the last Secretary to the Treasury to be a good one?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said, that the Departmental Committee had made such progress in its labours that it expected to be able to make its Report at an early date.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — THE VOLUNTEERS — THE CAPITATION GRANT.

VISCOUNT WOLMER (Hants, Petersfield) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any decision has yet been come to as to giving an additional capitation grant to the Volunteer Forces?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): No, Sir; there are still about 20 corps which have not sent in the Return called for by my Predecessor concerning their financial condition.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTION OF JOHN COX, SIGNALMAN ON THE SOMERSET AND DORSET RAILWAY.

MR. E. R. RUSSELL (Glasgow, Bridgeton) (for Mr. CHANNING) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of John Cox, a signalman in the employ of the Somerset and Dorset Railway Company, who was sentenced on the 29th of May last to six months' imprisonment for the results of an error in signalling; whether the Board of Trade has repeatedly insisted on the necessity of the adoption of the train staff system of working single lines, on the ground that it renders such mistakes impossible; whether, at the time of the mistake made by Cox, the Somerset and Dorset Railway Company had failed to adopt the train staff system; whether John Cox has now served nearly half of the sentence passed upon him; and, whether, under these circumstances, he will take into consideration the justice of advising a remission of the remainder of the term of imprisonment?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I have carefully considered the facts of the case of John Cox, and have to inform the hon. Member that I see no reason to depart from the decision arrived at by my Predecessor in Office—namely, that the case is not one in which he could advise interference. I am informed by the Board of Trade that, although they do not consider the system upon which the line is worked to be satisfactory, yet the accident could never have occurred if the signalman had done his duty. The Judge who tried the case expressed a similar opinion; and, under those circumstances, I must decline to advise any remission of the sentence.

COAL MINES—THE WOODEND COLLIERY EXPLOSION.

MR. BURT (Morpeth) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is true that the Woodend, or Bedford, Colliery, in which an explosion occurred, whereby thirty-eight lives were lost, was worked with the Davy lamp; whether he is aware that the Davy lamp not only gives a very imperfect light, but has been proved by the experiments of the Royal Commission on Accident in Mines to be utterly unsafe when the ventilating current exceeds six feet per second; whether his attention has been called to a communication sent to the Home Secretary in 1880 by the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines, in which the following statement was made:—

> "The employment of the ordinary Davy lamp, without a shield of metal or glass, in an

explosive mixture, when the current exceeds six feet a second, is attended with risk of accident, almost amounting to certainty. The Clanny lamp, when tested in a similar current, has proved to be scarcely, if at all, less dangerous;"

and, whether he can take steps to call the attention of colliery owners to the necessity of providing real safety lamps for the use of their workmen?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, that it appeared from the reports of the inquest that the Woodend Colliery was worked generally with the Davy lamp. He was quite aware of the conclusions that had been arrived at by the Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines with regard to the use of Davy lamps, and also of the Correspondence between the Home Secretary in 1880 and the Chairman of that Commission. The hon. Member for Morpeth might, perhaps, be aware that in a Bill which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) introduced last Session for the regulation of coal mines, special and elaborate provisions were made as to the construction of safety lamps used in mines. These or similar provisions he himself also hoped to re-introduce in a Bill which would be brought in at the first opportunity. Meanwhile, the hon. Member would perhaps feel that it would be inexpedient for the Home Office to prescribe the use of any particular lamps of any particular manufacturer, because Parliament might not approve the recommendation, and the expense incurred by colliery owners would be thrown away. The only thing he had power to do, and what he would do in the meantime, was to issue a Circular to colliery owners, drawing their attention to the conditions laid down by the Commission on Mines, with regard to the paramount importance of safety lamps, and also to those portions of the Report which dealt with the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different lamps now in use. Further, he meant to issue instructions to the Inspectors of Mines to insist upon the discontinuance of the lamps now in use in cases where the condition of the workings were such as to render the use of these lamps dangerous. He might add that work at the Woodend Colliery had been resumed with the sanction of the Inspector, and that the Marshall lamp was in use. The present decision of the Home Office was that it was not necessary to attend the inquest by counsel, seeing that the Inspector and his deputy were both present, and were fully competent to elicit all the facts which, in their view, were material.

ARMY—THE CAVAN MILITIA—LIEUTENANT W. H. MALCOLMSON.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for War, When it is the intention of the authorities to promote Lieutenant W. H. Malcolmson, of the Cavan Militia, to the rank of Captain; and, whether the fact of his having recently married without his commanding officer's consent is any bar to such promotion?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, Lieutenant W. H. Malcolmson was promoted on the 17th instant. His promotion appeared in *The Gazette* of that day, two days before the Notice of the hon. Member's Question was given.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—MR. C. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE.

MR. PETER M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If he will lay upon the Table of the House, the Report of the Treasury Remembrancer on the accounts of Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland, and if he will state the cost of the inquiry conducted by the Remembrancer, and out of what fund it was paid; and, if he will lay upon the Table the Report of the Commission or Committee of Inquiry, consisting of the Vice Chancellor, the Right Hon. Judge Flanagan, and a gentleman from the Treasury, appointed about twelve months ago to inquire into the state and working of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): The Report referred to in the first part of the Question was not addressed to the Treasury, but to the Bankruptcy Judges. Any Question as to its publication should, therefore, be addressed to my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland. The costs incurred in the inquiry amounted to £477, and it is not yet decided how they are to be provided for.

I understand that there is no objection to the publication of the Report referred to in the second part of the Question.

ARMY — THE CAVAN MILITIA — CAPTAIN SOMERSET MAXWELL.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Captain Somerset Maxwell, of the Cavan Militia, obtained leave of absence from his regiment at the last training; and, whether he was also absent during the training of 1884-5 ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, that Captain Somerset Maxwell was absent from part of the training in the year 1884, with leave on a certificate of ill-health, from the whole of the training for 1885, and from part of the training for 1886.

DR. TANNER: If he was absent on sick leave during portion of the training for 1886, may I ask how it was that he was able to undertake an active political canvas in other parts of the country ?

[No reply.]

ARMY—THE CAVAN MILITIA—COLONEL DEASE—MAJOR KERR.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Secretary of State for War, Why the authorities have prolonged Colonel Dease's command of the Cavan Militia for an additional five years; and, why Major Kerr, of the Cavan Militia, after serving upwards of thirty years, is not retired ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, the period of service of Colonel Dease had not been prolonged; but he was eligible for a prolongation of service if the Military Authorities thought right to grant it. They had power to do so in all cases where the officer had not attained 55 years of age.

DR. TANNER: May I ask if it is customary in connection with Militia appointments ?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am hardly able to give an answer to the Question; but if the hon. Member puts the Question down I will endeavour to give him an answer.

DR. TANNER: I beg to give Notice that on the Estimates I shall put this Question.

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PASSPORT AGENCIES.

MR. LIONEL COHEN (Paddington, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any special reason why Foreign Office passports are not issued at Liverpool; and, if not, whether the Government will consider the propriety of appointing an agency at Liverpool for the issue of Foreign Office passports, in the same way as has been for some time done at Bath, Dover, Yarmouth, Hull, Newcastle, Ramsgate, and other outposts ?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Passport Agencies at the Outports were instituted at a time when a passport was indispensable to travel on the Continent. Circumstances have now altered, and experience has shown that it is desirable that the issue of passports should be concentrated at the Foreign Office, from which they are easily obtainable by post. There being, therefore, no need for the Agencies, it has been decided to abolish them gradually by not filling the vacancies as they occur. This is the reason why there is no Foreign Office Passport Agency at Liverpool, while there still exist some in the less important towns of Bath, Yarmouth, &c.

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS)—ANGLING IN THE ORNAMENTAL WATERS.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Why the public are prevented from angling in the ornamental waters of the Regent's Park and the other Parks of the Metropolis; and, whether he will rescind the prohibition ?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I can assure the hon. Member that it is my wish that Regent's Park and the other Parks of the Metropolis should be made available for the recreation of the public as much as is possible. But there are very great difficulties in the way of allowing angling in these ornamental waters. In the first place, it is obvious that it would be impossible that all the inhabitants of London should be allowed to fish there. And it would be a very invidious and difficult matter to arrange any system of selection of particular individuals. I am informed that the main reason why the prohibition was originally introduced was that it was found by experience that the banks of the waters, and, indeed, all the grass in the neighbourhood, were seriously damaged by people tearing up the ground in search of bait and in other ways; and it was considered that the disfigurement thus caused to the appearance of the Parks was quite out of proportion to the enjoyment of those actually engaged in the sport of angling.

Mr. LAWSON inquired whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman was aware that the privilege was enjoyed up to the year 1869?

Mr. PLUNKET said, that he regretted to say that at the present moment he did not see his way to withdrawing the existing restriction.

REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR—CLAIMS OF THE LAND COMPANY.

Mr. J. HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps have been recently taken by Her Majesty's Government to represent the claims of the Ecuador Land Company against the Government of the Republic of Ecuador?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): The claims of the Company have been repeatedly pressed by Her Majesty's Minister at Quito on the Ecuadorian Government, who have promised that the matter would be inquired into and considered by the Council of State; but the disturbed state of the country and financial difficulties appear to have prevented any settlement being arrived at. Instructions will be sent to Her Majesty's Minister to report what is being done in the matter, and to endeavour to obtain a settlement.

RUSSIA—ILL-TREATMENT OF AN M.P. AT MOSCOW.

Mr. PULESTON (Devonport) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that an honourable Member of this House, now travelling in Russia, was deprived of his passport, and ordered to leave Moscow in twenty-four hours; and, if so, whether any representation can be made to the Russian authorities?

Mr. MONTAGU (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) said, that finding he was the Member to whom the Question referred, the House would perhaps allow him to make a short personal explanation. At the time he was in Moscow an order was issued by the Russian police that he must quit the city within 24 hours. No question had been asked him as to his religious belief; but he found that the Warsaw police had determined his religious persuasion for him, having stated in a paper attached to his passport that he was a Jew, and could only visit places not forbidden to Jews. That statement as to his faith he had unwittingly carried about with him, as he did not understand a word of Russian, and upon that the Russian police authorities at Moscow acted, although it was stated in his passport that he was a Member of the British House of Commons. A friend of his, to whom he mentioned the matter, assured him that the order would not be enforced; but he, however, left the city as soon as practicable.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): No information has reached the Foreign Office on the subject, nor has any hon. Member complained of any ill-treatment in Russia. Without this Her Majesty's Government could hardly make any representation.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER BARROW.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Treasury has yet arrived at any decision with regard to the recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the drainage of the basin of the Barrow in Ireland?

The SECRETARY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I am informed that the Report to which the hon. Member refers was addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, by whom the Commission was appointed, and no communication on the subject has been received from him at the Treasury.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) inquired whether the Barrow was included in the improvements intended by the Government to be made in the arterial drainage of Ireland, as indicated in the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.) said, he specifically mentioned the Shannon, Bann, and Barrow.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR inquired, whether, as the Barrow had just been reported upon by a Royal Commission, it was still the intention of the Government to refer that river again to a Royal Commission?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The question is, whether the work should be carried out by local resources? That is a very important matter, and has not yet been settled.

Mr. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the proposed drainage of the River Barrow, Whether any new scheme has been laid before Government; and, whether any decision has been arrived at in reference thereto, with a view to carrying it out?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, no definite scheme had been submitted to the Government; but Mr. Stripe, C.E., had forwarded copies of a Circular issued by him to persons interested.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can state how many evictions have taken place during the present month on the estates of Captain Hill and Mr. Nixon, in the neighbourhood of Gweedore, county Donegal; whether the majority of those evicted had been in the receipt of Poor Law relief during the past six months; how many of the Constabulary were employed on the service; what was the amount of rent due; and, what was the amount obtained under the ejectment proceedings?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that 16 evictions have taken place on Mr. Nixon's estate, all being re-admitted as caretakers, and 67 on Captain Hill's estate, 31 being re-admitted as caretakers. Many of those evicted have received more or less Poor Law relief within the last six months. Five officers and 170 men of the Constabulary were employed on the service. The total amount due was £290; the amount realized was £4. It is right, however, that I should add that there appears to be another side to this case, and if the House will permit me I will make one or two remarks upon it. I am told that the tenants evicted on Captain Hill's estate owed from three to five years' rent, and a list of sales of tenant right on that estate has been sent me, showing 11 cases in the last three years in which the tenant right of small holdings has been sold at prices varying from 30 to more than 100 years' purchase of the rental. In one case, that of a man named M'Garney, it is stated that he owed £4 for two years' rent up to May 1 last, and though this was not paid, he gave £51 last month to purchase a neighbouring tenant's holding.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask if the right hon. Gentleman would extend the information, and ascertain whether, as a matter of fact, the rents of these holdings have not been paid, so far as they have been paid, out of the wages of poor servant girls in America, and from the wages of male members of the families going to Scotland and England in search of employment?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have already endeavoured to make myself acquainted, as far as possible, with all the facts of the case.

ARMY—ROYAL MILITARY ASYLUM—ADMISSION OF SOLDIERS' CHILDREN.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is an established regulation at the Royal Military Asylum that, if a child of a soldier does not, on completion of his term at the Asylum, volunteer for the Army, no other child of the same soldier is to be received; and, if so, when was the regulation made, and by whose authority?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): Yes, Sir; the Regulation referred to was made at a Board of the Commissioners of the Royal Military Asylum held at Chelsea on July 31, 1884.

ARMY—THE FORCE IN BURMAH—REINFORCEMENTS.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can inform the House the number of officers, rank and file, of the three Forces at present in Burmah, or under orders for Burmah; and, whether the expenditure is included in the ordinary Estimates for the year, or will appear in a Supplementary Estimate?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer the Question. There is in Upper Burmah a Military Force of 284 officers and 17,080 men. Of these, 739 are Artillery, 296 Cavalry, 15,575 Infantry, and 754 Sappers. There is a force of 103 officers and 4,073 men in Lower Burmah. The reinforcements which are under orders to proceed to Burmah in the cold season are 203 officers and 9,934 men. Of these, 240 are Artillery, 2,580 Cavalry, and 7,317 Infantry. The expenditure is not included in the ordinary Estimates, and will not appear in a Supplementary Estimate, being borne by the Revenues of India.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) desired to know whether the hon. and learned Member could distinguish between Natives and Europeans?

SIR JOHN GORST: Of the forces now in Burmah there are 437 British Artillery and 370 Natives. The whole of the Cavalry are Native; and of the Infantry 3,000 and odd are British, and 12,000 and odd men are Natives.

FIJI—DECREASE OF POPULATION AND TRADE.

MR. HENNIKER-HEATON (Canterbury) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether in 1884 there were 4,052 more deaths than births among the natives of Fiji; whether there was a decrease of the imports and exports of £158,000 in 1885 as compared with 1884; and, will he cause an inquiry to be made as to the cause of this grave state of affairs, and particularly as to the native policy adopted there?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): In answer to my hon. Friend's first Question, I have to say that the figures he quotes do not correspond with the Official Returns, according to which the decrease of Native population in the year ending September 30, 1884, is stated as 2,562. That was the first year which showed a decided decrease, and its cause is said to be an epidemic of whooping cough; and the Administrator has pointed out the imperative necessity of attending to the sanitary conditions under which the Natives are living. As regards the exports and imports, my hon. Friend is correct in stating the falling off in 1885 as compared with 1884 as about £158,000. The Colony has, in recent years, suffered by the fall in the price of sugar, by the derangements of steam communication, by two years of drought, and by a disastrous hurricane. There is nothing before me to show that "Native policy" has had anything to do with the decrease in population or the falling off in trade.

SOUTH PACIFIC—REPORTED ANNEXATION OF THE ELLICE ISLANDS.

MR. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that Her Majesty's Government have annexed the Ellice Islands?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I am glad of the opportunity which the Question of my hon. Friend affords of saying that the report which has appeared in the newspapers of the annexation of the Ellice Islands by Great Britain is without any foundation.

WESTMINSTER HALL (RESTORATION).

MR. F. S. POWELL (Wigan) asked the First Commissioner of Works, What measures he proposes to adopt with reference to works for the restoration of Westminster Hall, and when operations are to be commenced?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): The works at Westminster Hall—as recommended by the Report of the Select Committee in April and by vote of the House in June of last year—are now about being carried out under the direction of Mr. J. A. Pearson, R.A. A contract has been entered into with Messrs. Shillitoe and Sons, of Bury St. Edmunds, the contractors for Truro Cathedral, and they are now making preparations and getting materials upon the site, so that the works will almost immediately be in active progress. Some delay, I believe, arose partly in consequence of the vacancy in the office of Consulting Surveyor, and partly owing to certain technical difficulties which arose in connection with the settlement of the contract.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) inquired when the Hall would be again open to the public, and when the ugly wooden hoardings would be taken away?

MR. PLUNKET desired to have Notice of the Question.

ARMY—THE WAR OFFICE—DEFECTIVE MILITARY WEAPONS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any, and what, complaints have been received during the last five years by the War Office from General Officers commanding in presence of the enemy as to the quality of the rifles, bayonets, swords, carbines, or their ammunition, as supplied to the Troops under their command; and, whether any, and what, complaints touching these matters have during those five years been made by the Military Departments of the War Office to the Civil Departments of the same Office?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said, that such complaints had been received, and steps had since been taken, and were still being taken, to remedy the matters complained of.

NAVY—BREECH-LOADING GUNS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What breech-loading guns there are on board ships in commission and afloat at this moment, theoretically capable of perforating eighteen inches of armour (whether steel, steel faced, or wrought iron), at 1,000 yards; and, whether the Captains of the ships carrying these guns have or have not been ordered not to fire them, and for what reasons?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing), in reply, said, that the *Colossus* was armed with two 12-inch 43-ton guns, capable of piercing 20 inches of armour at 1,000 yards. The *Edinburgh* and *Conqueror* had each two guns of similar calibre and power. The *Impérieuse* had four 9-inch 24-ton guns, capable of penetrating at 1,000 yards 18 inches of wrought iron. The captain of the *Colossus* had received directions not to practise with the big guns on board that vessel, in consequence of the accident to a similar gun on the *Collingwood.*

METROPOLIS—TEMPLE BAR.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry) asked the First Commissioner of Works, What has become of Temple Bar?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I am afraid I cannot answer this Question. Temple Bar was the property of the Corporation of London, and it was by them removed. What they have done with it I am not aware. I am afraid I can only refer my hon. Friend to the Corporation of London.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON gave Notice that he would call attention to the subject at an early opportunity, and move—

> "That the stones of Temple Bar, being historical relics, deserving of preservation, ought at once to be re-edified in some convenient position, as near as possible to the old site."

IRELAND (SOUTH WEST DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER.

MR. E. R. RUSSELL (Glasgow, Bridgeton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is proposed that General Sir Redvers Buller shall act in Kerry under the control of the local civil authorities?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Sir Redvers Buller will be given civil powers as a Divisional Magistrate. This will give him ample control over the Local Constabulary. The Resident Magistrates will, of course, be directed to aid him in his efforts to detect and prevent crime.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne) asked what relation Sir Redvers Buller would hold towards Captain Plunket?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: A new district will be formed. Captain Plunket's and, I believe, Mr. Byrne's district will be curtailed, and the new one formed out of Kerry and Clare, which will be placed under Sir Redvers Buller.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Will he be under the direction of the Inspector General of the Constabulary?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, he will not.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Then he will supersede all the officials except the Chief Secretary?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, Sir, he will not.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT—GRIEVANCES OF OFFICERS.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether any and what steps have been taken to remedy the admitted grievances of the officers of the Indian Telegraph Department; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the whole of the Correspondence that has passed on this subject, as well between the Director General of Telegraphs and the Indian Government as between the latter and the Indian Office?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): A scheme relating to the Telegraph Department in India was prepared by the late Secretary of State in Council, and transmitted to India on July 8. The Government of India was authorized to give effect to it, if, after obtaining the views of the Commission which has been appointed to consider the possibility of effecting reductions in the Public Expenditure, they should think it right to do so. Until the decision of the Government of India has been received, it is impossible to undertake to publish the Correspondence.

NAVY—THE ROYAL NAVAL ENGINE-ROOM ARTIFICERS.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will favourably consider the prayer of the Royal Naval Engine-room Artificers to have their position improved from Chief Petty Officers to that of Warrant Officers with their privileges, and particularly in reference to their present inadequate accommodation on board Her Majesty's ships, and the unequal amount of their pensions in proportion to their pay and as compared with other classes of Chief Petty Officers?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing), in reply, said, that the position of the Engine Room artificers would receive every consideration from the Board of Admiralty; but no Petition or prayer of the nature alluded to in the Question had as yet been received.

THE BELFAST RIOTS—THE CHARGES AGAINST THE IRISH CONSTABULARY.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, What course the Government intend to take with regard to the arrest and imprisonment, at Belfast, of a sergeant and eight constables of the Irish Constabulary Force, on the Belfast coroner's warrant, on a charge of wilful murder?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The constables referred to in the Question of the hon. Member have been arrested under the Coroner's waront, over which the Government has no control. Care, however, has been taken that these men shall have the advantage of adequate legal assistance; and it will, of course, be for their legal advisers to say what steps should be taken in their behalf.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman say whether the constables are to be admitted to bail?

MR. HOLMES: Any such application as that must come from the constables themselves; and it is upon that and such matters that their legal advisers will give them the assistance they require.

MR. SEXTON wished to know whether in recent years it had been usual for any one to be arrested in Ireland upon a Coroner's warrant?

MR. HOLMES: Arrests have been made on Coroners' warrants week after week, and, I may almost say, day after day in Ireland.

MR. HEALY (Cork): May I ask if the right hon. and learned Gentleman is aware that in the case of the Ballyragget inquest, in which police were similarly returned for trial, the Government of the day did not bring up the verdict into the Queen's Bench for the purpose of having it quashed?

MR. HOLMES: I really cannot answer as to what has been done on former occasions. The object of giving legal assistance to these constables is that they should have the fullest advice, and that all the steps that are necessary should be taken on their behalf. I may say further that, as far as I can understand, that has always been the case when any charges are made against the Constabulary, or proceedings are taken against them.

THE BELFAST RIOTS COMMISSION.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can communicate to the House the names of the Members added to the Commission on the Belfast riots?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): As the Belfast Commission now stands it is composed of an English officer (General Buller) and two barristers of the Irish Bar (Mr. French and Mr. Adams). We think that it should be strengthened by the addition of a police officer of experience and standing, who has had some experience in dealing with a population rather akin to that of Belfast, and therefore we propose to add to the Commission Mr. Wallis MacHardy, Chief Constable of Lanarkshire.

Mr. SEXTON: May I ask on what ground the Government think they are justified in adding to a Commission which they have themselves described as judicial a Scotch constable?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I do not know that the presence of a Scotchman on the Commission would make it of a less judicial character. My impression is, that considering the nature of the inquiry and the recommendations that the Commission are asked to make with regard to the Police Force of Belfast, the presence of a gentleman who has had such experience as has fallen to the lot of Mr. MacHardy would be very valuable indeed.

RAILWAY CHARGES—THE RETURN.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, When the Return of Railway Charges, ordered 1st February 1886, will be in the hands of Members?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Returns to the Order referred to by the hon. Member have not yet been received from all the Companies; but a further communication has been addressed by the Board of Trade to the Companies who have failed to give the necessary information, and replies have been received to the effect that the Returns are in preparation, and will shortly be sent in.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—MARYBOROUGH DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM.

Mr. LALOR (Queen's County, Leix) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it be true, as reported in *The Freeman's Journal*, that Doctor David Jacob having resigned the position of Visiting Physician to the District Lunatic Asylum at Maryborough, in the Queen's county, in favour of his son, Doctor W. S. Jacob, the Board of Governors have elected the said Doctor W. S. Jacob to that office; whether the Resident Medical Superintendent of the Asylum is a first cousin to the said Doctor W. S. Jacob, and the Government Inspector, Doctor G. W. Hatchell, is his uncle; as he is also the father of the Resident Medical Superintendent of the Asylum, Doctor Joseph Henry Hatchell; and, whether, considering the intimate family connection existing between these several parties, the Government will sanction the appointment of the said Doctor W. S. Jacob as Visiting Physician to the Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the office of Visiting Physician became vacant by the resignation of Dr. Jacob, senior. The vacancy was advertized in the usual manner, and the Board of Governors elected Dr. W. S. Jacob. He was not aware of any ground for the suggestion that there was any previous understanding that such an appointment should be made. Dr. Jacob, junior, was not cousin to the Resident Medical Superintendent, nor was the Government Inspector his uncle. Dr. Jacob, senior, who had now resigned, and the Resident Medical Superintendent were connected by marriage. When the new appointment was submitted to the Lord Lieutenant for confirmation, it would be for His Excellency to consider whether there was any reason why he should decline to confirm it.

GOLD AND SILVER HALL-MARKING.

Mr. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether Her Majesty's Government will undertake, during the Recess, to consider the question of hall-marking of gold and silver wares, with a view, as soon as the state of public business may permit, to reform the Law of compulsory hall-marking, especially with regard to the watch-case trade, as unanimously recommended by the Select Committee on Hall-Marking (1878-9); and, whether Her Majesty Government will undertake to ascertain, and report to the House, the exact methods of hall-marking adopted by the Austrian and French Governments respectively, especially as regards the practice known as "the touch," with a view to its adoption, when desirable, in this Country in place of the prevailing uniform practice of "the scrape and parting assay?"

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): With regard to the first part of the hon. Member's Question, I am not in a position at the present moment to give him a definite reply. But with respect to the second part of the Question, I shall be happy to communicate with the Foreign Office, with the view of obtaining, if possible, the particulars he is anxious to receive from the Austrian and French Governments; but, from the information at my disposal, I do not think that it would be desirable to alter the present practice of assay.

WEST INDIES—ISLAND OF JAMAICA—ALLEGED DEPREDATIONS BY A SPANISH MAN-OF-WAR.

SIR JOHN SIMON (Dewsbury) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether information has been received at the Colonial Office of certain alleged depredations by a Spanish man-of-war off the Island of Jamaica by boarding vessels and searching for arms and ammunition; and, whether the Government are prepared to take steps to put an end to this gross violation of the law of nations?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle), in reply, said, that the private Notice which the hon. and learned Member had sent of this Question had not reached him, and he, therefore, would ask the hon. and learned Member to postpone the Question till to-morrow?

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—ARREST OF THE CROFTERS AT TIREE.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is true that the precognition of the witnesses who made declarations with respect to the alleged mobbing and rioting at Tiree which led to the arrest of six crofters disclosed no act of injury or damage to person or property; whether it is true that none of the men arrested were present when the alleged deforcement of the messenger-at-arms took place; and, further, whether it is true that the Procurator-Fiscal is also a member of the firm of Sproat and Cameron, the law agents to the Duke of Argyll?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities) (who replied) said: I believe it to be correct that Mr. Sproat, the Procurator Fiscal, is a member of the firm referred to. As regards the rest of the hon. Member's Question, I cannot agree to give any answer, because it is a Question with reference to inquiries which are being made by the Crown with a view to a prosecution, and which are necessarily confidential until the trial takes place.

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EMPLOYMENT AT EVICTIONS.

MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the duty of the Constabulary to give assistance to sheriffs' officers; and, whether the Chief Secretary has seen the report of the evictions at Woodford?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol. W.), in reply, said, he had only received Notice of this Question since he came into the House. He had not seen the Report to which it referred. It was the duty of the Constabulary to give every assistance to Sheriffs' officers in the execution of the law. What precise steps were taken in this case he did not know. If the hon. Gentleman wished further information, and would put the Question on the Paper, he would endeavour to answer it.

MR. SHEEHY said, he would repeat the Question on Thursday.

THE NEW POLICE OFFICES.

MR. CAVENDISH-BENTINCK (Whitehaven) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether it is true that Her Majesty's Government have acquired a site on the Thames Embankment near Westminster Bridge for the purpose of erecting new police offices; and, whether the erection of the buildings there will be under the control of the Department of the First Commissioner of Works?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I have heard incidentally that this site has been acquired for the new Police Offices; but the matter is in no way under the control of the Office of Works; it is an affair of the Home Office, to which Department I must refer my right hon. and learned Friend.

MR. CAVENDISH-BENTINCK: I beg to give Notice that on the earliest opportunity I shall move that it is expedient that all public buildings should be placed under the control of one Government Department.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August.]—[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said, that at present they were in a somewhat curious political situation. They had a Tory Ministry in power without a Tory majority of their own supporters. Upon the Opposition side of the House they had Gentlemen whose policy was not to oppose the Tory Ministry, and the Tory Ministry were dependent for their maintenance in Office on Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House who disagreed with some of their own Party. They were engaged in thanking Her Majesty for Her Gracious Speech. Certainly, considering that the Speech contained absolutely nothing, they were grateful for exceedingly small mercies. It was well known that the Speech was only nominally that of Her Majesty; in reality it was the Speech of the Ministry, and he should, therefore, not be wanting in respect if he said that the Speech seemed to him to be conceived in the spirit of the demand of the footpad—"Give me your purse, and say nothing whatever about it. Don't venture to talk." That wonderful Speech had been very short; but it had been supplemented by the speech of the noble Lord the Leader of the House, who had said that the policy of the Government was a policy of immense deliberation. Well, but the gifted beings who ruled over them had deliberated. They contemplated the appointment of a certain number of Commissions in Ireland; and in the meantime they had sent a Major General there to look after the Irish, and they assured the Irish landlords that if that Major General was not successful in enabling them to obtain their full rents, they would ask the British taxpayer to make up the difference to them. The Dissentient Liberals on his side of the House were silent. He did not know whether silence gave consent to the policy of Ministers. All they knew respecting the opinions of those Gentlemen was that they had opposed the Statutory Parliament proposed by the late Prime Minister, and if he were to judge from their Election orations they were as strongly opposed to the Land Purchase scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They appeared to have preferred that the destinies of the country should be in the hands of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, rather than in those of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, because of their disapproval, not only of the Statutory Parliament, but of the Land Purchase Bill of the late Government. Their objections to those plans must have been very strong to lead them to support the Tory Party during the late Elections, and particularly to have supported the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who put forward an Electioneering manifesto, which might be taken, from the noble Lord's position in the Party, to be the manifesto of the Party of which he was now the Head in that House. In that manifesto the noble Lord spoke of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian as having been guilty of a conspiracy more base than any of the designs and plots which he had conceived for the last

25 years—referred to the right hon. Gentleman's plans as the outcome of political hysterics and worthy only of Colney Hatch or Bedlam. This "tissue of absurdities," as the noble Lord termed the Prime Minister's Bill, was produced for no other reason than "to gratify the ambition of an old man in a hurry." [*Ministerial cheers.*] He could understand hon. Members opposite cheering that manifesto, but every Radical must regard it as an insult to the whole Radical Party. He did not believe that manifesto was approved by the Liberal Dissentients. He was surprised that they had not taken the first opportunity of addressing to the public, through their constituencies, a protest against its terms. But who were these Dissentients? According to themselves and their admirers, they were the flower of the Liberal Party. It was said the other day in one of their organs, or one of the organs of the Conservative Party, which he supposed was the same thing, that everyone would admit that they contained nine-tenths of the ability, reputation, and intelligence of the Liberal Party. Now, he had observed the same sort of thing in a great many newspapers; but newspaper editors had an unfortunate habit of making their standard of intelligence in agreement with themselves. It appeared that the great body of the Liberal Party had sinned against the light. They had no business to have opinions. It was their duty to subordinate their views to their political superiors. But he should take the liberty to make a slight comparison between the flower of the Liberal Party and other Gentlemen who also sat on that side of the House. They had on his side the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). Surely the right hon. Gentleman was equal, he would not say for a moment superior—he would not say anything invidious—to the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). Then there was his right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). Perhaps his right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) would excuse him for saying that the right hon. Member for Derby was his equal. They all recognized the great ability and intelligence of the right hon. and learned Member for Bury (Sir Henry James). Still, he thought the late Attorney General (Sir Charles Russell) was the equal of that right hon. and learned Member. Then there was the right hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Heneage). He would not venture to pit any single individual against a Gentleman of such masterly intelligence; but he did almost think that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley), the late President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Mundella), and the late Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) and other Gentlemen who sat on that Bench, were perhaps almost the equal in intelligence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Grimsby. The majority of the Dissentients were Whigs. Now, whatever the Whigs might have been once, they were now a small aristocratic body with exceedingly few followers in the country; they had almost all gone over to the Conservative side. They never had a majority in the House. But they always exercised a weight out of all proportion to their numbers in the Liberal Party, because they had always managed in some way to get in large numbers upon the Executive. They might well use the words, *Sic vos non vobis.* They always got into Office and kept themselves in Office. In this art they were, of course, the superiors of the Radicals. There was nothing in the alliance of the Whigs with the Tories. To the Whigs, politics were nothing but a game between two rival aristocratic bands, with Office as the stakes. They had always been ready to ally themselves with the Tories when they thought the Democratic coach was going too fast. He did not blame them for it; but he protested against the prescriptive right which those Gentlemen seemed to think they had to be the Leaders of the Liberal Party, and against the opinion they seemed to entertain that when they spoke Liberals were to hear and obey. Besides this Whig gang and some other nondescripts here and there, there was what perhaps he might term the Birmingham gang. The Head of the Birmingham gang was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. The gang consisted mainly of the family of the right hon. Gentleman and the present and ex-Town Councillors and Aldermen of Birmingham. No doubt, the people of Birmingham owed these Gentlemen gratitude for their

municipal services; but at the Elections they appear to have subordinated Imperial interests to municipal gratitude. In the country and beyond Birmingham he thought these Birmingham Gentlemen had no sort of influence, and that was not surprising, for the views of the right hon. Gentleman on Ireland had frequently been before the public, and the right hon. Gentleman had never made a speech on the subject without proposing some new plan and contradicting some previous speech of his own. It seemed to him that the basis of the right hon. Gentleman's policy in regard to Ireland was that no scheme was to be judged on its merits, and that no scheme could possibly be good of which he himself was not the author. In fact, the right hon. Gentleman's policy was to reverse the words of Dickens—"Short's your friend, not Codlin." The Radicals in the country, as soon as they perceived that the right hon. Gentleman desired to establish a Dictatorship for himself in the Radical Party, protested against it; but they were still more indignant when they found the right hon. Gentleman calling in the Tories as allies in order to force that Dictatorship upon them. He wished to point out that no Dissentient Liberal who had had to submit to a contest at the Elections had been returned by Liberal votes. There was a majority in favour of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian in Scotland and Wales, and in Great Britain 1,300,000 Liberal electors voted in favour of it. The Dissentient Liberals were not convinced by the argument of figures, and attributed the votes given in favour of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian to a temporary aberration of intelligence on the part of the electors. But there was no doubt that the policy of the Liberal Party must be the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. Still these Whig Gentlemen met at Devonshire House. They deposed the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian and chose the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale as their Leader, declared themselves to be the Liberal Party, and proceeded to state what were the views of this Party—namely, to keep the Tories in Office until the recalcitrant Liberals accepted their Leaders. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham was at that meeting. Not long ago the right hon. Member for West Birmingham denounced the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale as a Rip van Winkle; and the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale pointed out that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, with his doctrine of ransom, was little better than a bandit. He was very curious to know what concessions on the one side or the other had brought these two hon. Members together. He deplored the fall of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was worthy of better things than to become a mere Whig henchman and to elaborate policies for the Liberal Party in a ducal drawing-room. When the Doge of Genoa visited Louis XIV. at Versailles he was asked what was the most strange thing he had seen at Versailles, and he answered, "Myself." If the right hon. Gentleman had been asked what was the most strange thing he had seen at Devonshire House, and had answered sincerely, he would have said, "Myself." *Facilis descensus Averni;* and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would pause in his downward career. If not, the next thing that would be heard of would be that the right hon. Gentleman had been gazetted Lord Chamberlain, and the right hon. Gentleman would produce a genealogy—certified to by the Somerset Herald-at-Arms—that he was descended from the Sire de Chamberlain, who came to England with the Sire de Brassey at the time of the Norman Conquest. The Radicals did not for a moment ignore the great qualities of the right hon. Gentleman, and would always be glad to receive him as one of their Leaders; but as a Dictator forced upon them by an illustrious family and Tory votes the Radicals would never accept him. He believed that the majority of the electors were in favour of Home Rule, and that the Land Purchase Bill lost the Election. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian introduced that Bill, not that he particularly approved of it, but to conciliate the Tories. The right hon. Gentleman did not conciliate the Tories, and alienated a considerable number of Radicals. The fact was that Democrats had no sort of sympathy with landlords in this country, and they had still less sympathy with landlords in Ireland. They considered that the distressful state of Ireland was mainly due to the oppression and iniquities of the Irish landlords; and far from wishing to buy them out they were perfectly ready to leave them to the tender mercies of an Irish Parliament. He had no doubt they would receive justice; and no doubt useful precedents would be established for Democrats dealing with landlords in this country. He did not envy the position of Her Majesty's Government. The position of Dissentient Liberals in the House was sufficiently humiliating; but not so humiliating as the position of the Government, who were obliged to bow the knee to the Whigs. He looked upon the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a sort of Sinbad, with the Whigs upon his back, and the Whig bridle in his mouth, and he wished him joy of them. At the same time, he (Mr. Labouchere) was anxious to conciliate. He was always in favour of a fatted-calf policy, and if the Dissentients would come back the rest of the Party would be ready to receive them with open arms. But he did not think even the Prodigal Son would have been received with open arms if he had returned to his father with a band of the companions of his debaucheries to knock at his father's door. If he had wished to dislodge his father from his seat at the head of the table, and had told the decent, respectable friends of his father that they were to wait on this prodigal son and his companions, he suspected there would have been very little fatted calf for them. The direct issue at the Elections was the question of Ireland, yet there was no mention of Ireland in Her Majesty's Speech. That was, however, supplemented by the statements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in that House, and of a noble Lord in "another place," and their declaration was that there was to be no Statutory Parliament for Ireland. That was perfectly natural; but when they went on to say that the question was finally settled they went entirely beyond the mark. Did they imagine for one moment that the Irish people would consider the question was finally settled until they had achieved their right to self-government? It was no longer a question between the millions of Great Britain and the population of Ireland, but it was a question between the Radical Democracy and the privileged classes. It was a new and monstrous doctrine to contend that the Liberal Party when defeated on a great question like that of Home Rule should humbly acknowledge the defeat and declare that they would cease to strive for the ends which they held desirable. How many reforms would the Liberal Party have carried if they had allowed themselves to be ruled by a doctrine of that kind? He trusted that the Irish would not abate one jot or tittle of their demands, and that in the prosecution of their object they would adopt every means which was legitimate in the case of a nation wrestling to be free. He honoured them for their dogged resistance. The vilest of slavery was the slavery of race to race. There were Irishmen all over the world, driven out of their country by oppression and misery, and it was a magnificent sight to see them still united with their brethren in Ireland in their tireless effort to obtain self-government for their unhappy island. For centuries they had struggled against servitude, for centuries they had clung to their nationality, and now, when the cup was within reach of their lips, they were asked to abandon their design. It had been said that the Chicago Convention would lead to a split; it had done nothing of the kind, but had resulted in an expression of undiminished confidence in the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The Irish might well be proud of their Leader, who was conspicuous for energy, ability, tenacity of purpose, and for the possession of the *mens æqua in arduis.* His contempt for the insults which were heaped upon him by the English Press also compelled admiration. When silent, he was told that he did not dare to speak, and that he was a coward; when he spoke, he was told that he could not be believed, because he was a liar. Sometimes he was even called an assassin; but he could treat all these attacks with contempt, because he had gained the love of his countrymen and the respect of every Englishman whose respect was worth having. It had been said that Jefferson Davis had "made a nation;" but it might with even more truth be said that the hon. Member for Cork had made the Irish nation. It was a curious fact of journalism that the two men most grossly abused were the two men most popular in their respective nations—the hon. Member for Cork and the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. Hon. Members opposite called the followers of the hon. Member for Cork a mercenary band, because they were supplied with money from America for Party purposes. That Irishmen abroad should send over money to enable Ireland to achieve what she desired showed their ineradicable love for their country. The sneer came with exceedingly bad grace from representatives of the privileged class. How many Gentlemen sitting opposite, he should like to know, had had their Election expenses paid out of funds subscribed by Dukes and Marquesses? It would appear that while it was a dishonourable thing for a poor Member to receive help from his country, it was an honourable thing for Gentlemen opposite, and perhaps some Dissentients on his own side of the House, to sit as the henchman, sycophants, and followers of some noble Duke or other. The intention of the present Government in regard to Home Rule was perfectly obvious. It was that nothing in the shape of local self-government should be given to Ireland. He knew that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had talked vaguely of some scheme which should apply equally to England, Scotland, and Ireland; but no good could come of any identical scheme for the three countries, because a plan suited to England would not be suited to Scotland, and certainly not to Ireland. Like some of his Predecessors, the noble Lord the Leader of the House had already begun to juggle with the figures relating to agrarian crime. When it served their purpose Ministers declared that there was no agrarian crime, and when the contrary served their purpose better they said that there was a vast amount of it. The noble Lord had said that this kind of crime had increased, and he doubtless hoped that it would increase to a still greater extent. Winter was coming on, evictions were becoming more in number, and the noble Lord was about to commission the military to aid in carrying them out. That was what he called "maintaining order." Was it possible to suppose that when men should see their wives and children driven from their homes there would be no disturbance in Ireland? [An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] An hon. Member opposite said "Hear, hear!" He should despise the Irish if in such circumstances they were to remain passive. Well, these disturbances would serve the Government as an excuse for not granting any kind of Home Rule, and then would come the Salisbury policy—the Hottentot policy—of "20 years' firm government." At the end of that period, if the Irish kissed the rod, they would then perhaps have some small modicum of local self-government given to them. It had been the object of the Tory Party to show that if Home Rule were granted there would be disturbances in many parts of the country, and with that view the noble Lord proceed to Belfast, and there fanned the flames of religious bigotry, and when his efforts had been crowned with success, and when disturbance did break out, he and his Friends came forward saying—"We have proved our case, for you see the bare idea of Home Rule has been the cause of serious disturbances." He thought, for his own part, from their experience of the noble Lord and his Friends and their manœuvres in regard to Belfast that they were most anxious and would do their best in order that there should be disturbances throughout Ireland. The fact was the Tories—the privileged classes—did not want this Irish Question settled. They were not such fools as to kill the hen that laid the golden eggs. Ireland was the best card in their hands. They knew that there was a strong feeling in the country against the privileged classes and their privileges, and they considered it good policy to divert attention from them by stirring up ill-feeling and race animosity in Ireland. He rerejoiced at the declaration of the late Prime Minister that he would never cease to protest till Ireland had a Domestic Legislature. That pronouncement would be a message of peace and goodwill to Ireland. The Unionists and the Conservatives declared they would never consent to the establishment of such a Legislature for Ireland, so that no compromise between them and the Radicals was possible. But if the Liberal Party were true to Ireland, and the Irish were true to them, he had no doubt that the cause would win in the end. The policy of the masses would overthrow the policy of the classes. The noble Lord did not limit himself to a negative policy, but announced that a certain General would be sent to Ireland. No doubt this General was a brave and brilliant soldier, but it was singular that in the exercise of his profession he had been mainly occupied in slaying and crushing the Nationalists of Africa. The late Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) declined to sanction the employment of the military and constabulary in the work of rent collecting, and it was owing to this that Ireland had been comparatively peaceful. He wished to know whether the Military Forces of the Crown were to be employed only in preventing outrages or also in aiding the landlords to collect their rents? If they were to perform the latter duty, it was vain to hope for peace or quiet in Ireland. Then the noble Lord had announced the proposed appointment of various Commissions. It seemed to him that this Government might fairly be described as one of Commissions and omissions. The first Commission was to be one for drainage, &c., to be composed of men well known in engineering and contracting works; so contractors would benefit if nobody else did. But this work ought to be the work of an Irish Parliament. The country had had Commission upon Commission, and the question was whether any real work was now to be done or not? The other Commission was to investigate the operation of the Land Act in Ireland. It had been admitted by all, he thought, with the exception of the noble Lord, that judicial rents were at present and must in the nature of things be too high owing to the fall in the value of produce. The noble Lord stated that the Commissioners in awarding the judicial rents had taken into consideration the possible fall of the value of produce. He never heard that stated before, and no one who was concerned in the forming of the Commission or the Commissioners themselves had any such idea. It should be remembered that there were 530,000 holdings in Ireland that could not possibly bear any rent at all and enable the tenants to live and thrive at the same time. Therefore, the formation of this Commission was nothing more than a dilatory plea, and meant very little. But the Government went further, and stated their views with regard to the Land Act. The noble Lord on the Front Opposition Bench, and the noble Lord on the Ministerial Bench, had laid it down that the judicial rent was a final settlement of the whole question of rent with regard to the landlords. When the rent was reduced, the landlords, as he understood it, were guaranteed that they should not in any way suffer if the tenant was unable to pay the rent. The second proposition of the two noble Lords was that dual ownership in the land was undesirable in Ireland. The noble Lord opposite, on these two propositions, founded what he took to represent the policy of the Government—namely, that the State was bound to indemnify the landlords if they did not receive any rent, or a rent less than that which they had a right to under the award of the Land Commission; and that the State ought to buy out the landlords of Ireland. But it was not only that the State ought to buy out the landlords, but that it ought to buy them out not at the actual commercial price of the land now, but upon the value at which it stood in 1881. Then he should like to know where the money was to come from for all this? He presumed that it was, if possible, to be screwed out of the Irish people; and if it could not be got in that way, it was to be drawn from the English people. In any case, it was obvious that the English would have to give a guarantee for it. In fact, according to the reasoning of the noble Lords, we had already given the Irish landlords a guarantee for the amount of the judicial rent, and if the landlords were bought out we should have to give a guarantee for the payment of £300,000,000. What was this but a Land Purchase scheme? What was the difference between this and the Land Purchase scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian? The only difference was that they were to receive more money than they would get under the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. He was glad that the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool had protested against such a scheme. He was glad that the hon. Gentleman and the Irish Convention had stated that the Irish people were not ready to sell their birthright for any such mess of pottage. As far as he could see if they did so they would be called upon to pay for the pottage. If we were mortgagees for the greater part of the land, and we guaranteed the rent to the owners of the rest, was it likely that we should grant the Irish

Home Rule? It would be said that the enormous financial interests which we had in Ireland gave us a right to remain there. They knew very well that this scheme was a simple mode of rendering Home Rule impossible. He should like to know what the Conservatives had to say to such a scheme, and what was the opinion of the Dissentient Liberals with regard to it? Liberal Members knew that their constituencies were placarded with great broadsheets denouncing them because it was said that if they were elected the English taxpayers would have to pay a vast sum of money. The Conservatives and the Unionists in Northampton united to oppose him and his Colleague, and the result of the coalition of the two Parties was that they hired a donkey. This quadruped went about the streets with great placards on his back, stating that if he and his Colleague were elected the unhappy people of Northampton would have to pay their share of £150,000,000, which the late Prime Minister was going to take out of the pockets of the British taxpayers and give to the Irish. It appeared to him that this donkey represented the policy of the Unionists and of the Conservatives. The Dissentient Unionists, more than anyone else, protested against this scheme of Land Purchase, and sided with the Government. He thought that they should make some public announcement at once upon the subject. What had the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to say to it? The right hon. Gentleman distinguished himself by his declaration that the landlords and the privileged classes ought to pay ransom; but it would seem, according to this scheme, that the plan of ransom existed, but that the ransom ought to be paid to the landlords. Was the right hon. Gentleman in favour of the scheme, and did he propose to vote for it when it was brought forward? Both sides of the House had protested against any scheme of Land Purchase, and it was no part or parcel of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian for the settlement of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman asked the constituencies merely to say whether they were in favour of a domestic Legislature for Ireland. If that was the case, and there was a majority in the House and in the constituencies against a Land Purchase Scheme, it would be perfectly monstrous if such a scheme were forced upon the House, and, by arrangements and intrigues, carried through. Before any such scheme was passed there should be an appeal to the country. He quite understood the dislike of hon. Gentlemen opposite to such an appeal. They were eager for an appeal in the last Parliament. But he should like to know whether the country had been consulted upon this Land Purchase Scheme? So far as it had been consulted, it had pronounced against any such scheme; and he submitted that they ought to use every Form of the House in order to insist that before the country was pledged to a scheme involving, perhaps, £300,000,000, it should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am unwilling to trespass upon the time of the House by taking part in a debate which can have no definite issue, which relates to a policy almost entirely in the future, and the prolongation of which, therefore, seems to me, with all deference to hon. Members, to be hardly a useful adaptation of the time of the House. The policy which my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer so clearly and so fully put before the House the other night has been submitted to such an extraordinary process of what the hon. Gentleman opposite who has just addressed us called generalization on the part of hon. Members on the other side of the House, that I think Her Majesty's Government cannot now, in the caricature which is presented to them, recognize any child of their own. I shall, therefore, endeavour to recall, as shortly as possible, and I hope very plainly, the attention of the House to what our policy really is, and to strip it of the enormous exaggerations and misrepresentations brought upon it by hon. Members opposite. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) always interests and amuses the House; but he will pardon me for saying that in the speeches which he addresses to us I think he sometimes goes a little beyond what he really means. When he charged us, as a Government, with encouraging outrages and promoting disturbances in Ireland, when he told us that we were prepared to turn loose the military upon the tenants at the bidding of the landlords, he made charges for which, if they were true, we should deserve to be impeached. But he made them in such a good-humoured way that I know perfectly well he attached no more real importance to them than he did to his description of the Irish nation as a race in slavery to the English race, or to his frequent references to the privileged classes, whose privilege mainly, it appears to me, consists of being invariably abused by the hon. Gentleman. But, if I may venture to say it, we have had more serious speeches than that of the hon. Member for Northampton, and speeches which appear to me to stand more in need of reply. We had a speech the other evening from the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), who spoke, as he always does, with a fervid and native eloquence; but he also seemed to be a little hard on the Government when he described their policy as one of coercion, bankruptcy, and repudiation. He must have had something else in his mind; he must have quoted a sentence that he might have applied to a former Government, who had propounded a very different policy. Our policy is, I will venture to say, a very plain policy; it is, I hope, a sober policy; it is a policy which has for its great object the social and the material welfare of Ireland. Let me add that it is a policy to obtain what I believe is earnestly desired—namely, some rest from that ceaseless political agitation which has disturbed Ireland so long. Well, as part of that policy, we have stated to the House our intention to propose an important inquiry into the development of the material resources of Ireland. [*Home Rule laughter.*] I do not know why that proposal was met with the ridicule which it evoked. I remember the discussion of Irish affairs in this House for some years past, and up to the present time these very matters which were alluded to by my noble Friend were the matters in respect of which the popular Irish Party were always most earnest in their demand for favourable consideration by the Government and by Parliament. And yet, Sir, we are told, forsooth, by the hon. Member for Liverpool that we are bribing, demoralizing, and cheating the Irish people when we attempt to take what, as I shall afterwards show, is a real and practicable step towards seeing whether that policy can be carried into effect, and whether the material interests of Ireland can be promoted in that way. My noble Friend spoke of our determination to restore and to maintain social order in Ireland, exerting all the forces at our disposal for the purpose, and if those forces fail coming to Parliament for increased powers; and we are told, forsooth, that he has made a great discovery of something new, and it is said that social disorder can never be treated except in concert with the redress of grievances out of which the social disorder springs. I remember when the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) held different opinions from those he expressed the other night, when he denounced the doctrines of the leaders of the Land League as doctrines of treason and assassination, and proposed to take a very active part in proposing to Parliament measures of repression unaccompanied by any measures of a remedial character. The right hon. Gentleman never spoke then of redressing the grievances out of which sprung the disorders which he asked Parliament to give powers to put down. When the right hon. Gentleman not very long ago as Home Secretary had to superintend the restoring of social order in the Isle of Skye, what did he do then? He did not wait for the passing of a Crofters Bill, but he sent down gunboats and Marines to put down the crofters. Oh, no, Sir; this idea that a necessary accompaniment of the restoration of social order is the redress of grievances is a modern discovery.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I announced a Crofters Bill at the same time.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes; but the right hon. Gentleman never went forward with it. It was on an occasion subsequent to that to which I have alluded that the Crofters Bill was announced. What is the grievance to which the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was mainly directed? What, in his opinion, is the great Irish grievance which requires to be redressed? Why, Sir, it is the want of a separate Irish Government and a separate Irish Parliament. Why is not the right hon. Gentleman on this side of the House now to ask the House of Commons to consent to that policy? Because he knows very well, as we all know, in spite of the statements of the hon. Member for Northampton, that the country has distinctly and decisively pronounced against it. Therefore, he was telling us to redress grievances in spite of pledges he knows full well we have made against a separate Irish Parliament and a separate Irish Government, and in spite of the fact, which he knows full well, that it is impossible for a Government possessing the confidence of the present House of Commons to propose any such measures. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman another question on this matter. What has this to do with the restoration of social order in Belfast? Was social order disturbed in Belfast on account of the absence of a separate Irish Government or a separate Irish Parliament? [Mr. Biggar: Yes; certainly.] No; my impression is that the main reason for the disturbance of social order in Belfast was those unhappy feelings which were excited in that great town by the proposal of a separate Government. But I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman another thing—Is rioting in Belfast, is "Moonlighting" in Kerry, to be permitted to go on until the constituencies have changed their minds and have returned a House of Commons which will adopt the policy favoured by the right hon. Gentleman? Can the right hon. Gentleman, or the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), tell us anything in the Government, or the law, or the administration of Ireland, which justifies the rioting in Belfast or Moonlighting in Kerry? If they cannot tell us anything of this sort, why does the right hon. Gentleman sneer at our efforts to put these evils down? Why did he sneer at us for retaining the services of an able man like Sir Redvers Buller, and sending him with full power to alter and control the organization of the police with a view to the detection and the repression of crime in Kerry? Why did he sneer at our action in Belfast, say that we were bringing the military in to do police work, and make that kind of accusation against us? Sir, we look upon it as our duty as a Government to maintain order, to enforce the law as we find it, considering carefully at the same time if in any matter the law is wrong or unjust, and deciding as soon as we can, if we find it so, to make proposals to Parliament to alter it. I should almost have supposed that the magnanimity of the right hon. Member for Derby, considering that he has escaped himself from the difficult task of administering the Government of Ireland, considering that by the policy which he and his Colleagues adopted they rendered that task immeasurably more difficult, I should almost have thought his magnanimity would have prompted him, at least, to render some aid in the opening days of our work, in meeting the difficulties before us. But if the right hon. Gentleman could not do that, if he held that the policy indicated in the speech of my noble Friend was radically wrong, I should have thought that the courage displayed in the criticism by which he disposed of it would have led him to move an Amendment to the Address. No, Sir; the right hon. Gentleman does none of these things; what he does is to stab us in the back with misrepresentations of our policy, by charging my noble Friend with inciting landlords to exact full rents and with precipitating evictions, and by quoting an expression of opinion from Sir James Caird which was misunderstood, and which Sir James Caird himself has since publicly stated was misunderstood. The right hon. Gentleman quoted that opinion that economical rent had disappeared for the present from 528,000 holdings in Ireland, as what? As a dangerous suggestion to Irish tenants that they should not fulfil their legal obligations. No, Sir; the policy of the right hon. Gentleman is just this—he will not attack us openly; he stabs us in the back. He chalks "No rent" upon the wall, and then he runs away. Does he wish us to rush into legislation upon this most important and difficult question of the land? If so, I should like to know what he would himself propose? He gave no hint of that in his criticism upon our policy. He did not say he was in favour of a Bill for suspending the eviction of tenants under judicial rents. Oh, no, Sir; he merely gave hints to be taken by those whom they may concern. He could not make such a proposal, because he was one of the authors of the Irish Land Act of 1881; and he knows very well, and those right hon. Gentlemen sitting beside him know very well, that any such proposal would be the deathblow of that system of judicial rents which was the main feature of that Act in relation to Irish tenants. Although the right hon. Gentleman does not suggest any change himself he charges us with delay; he charges us—and the charge has been repeated by a good many Members below the Gangway—with proposing a policy of inquiry merely with the view of postponing any action on our part. Of course, we are told that our object is to keep ourselves in the enjoyments of the sweets of Office. [*Opposition cheers.*] Well, if hon. Members who knew as much of the sweets of Office and of its anxieties and responsibilities as I do they would not be so ready to make the suggestion. What is this policy of inquiry on which we have resolved? We have to do two things. In the first place we have to carry on the administration of Ireland. I have already referred to the enormous difficulties of that task. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in one of his speeches in the last Parliament, or at the time of the Election, referred to the fact that he believed he had, by the introduction of his schemes, made the government of Ireland impossible in any other way than by the granting of a separate Irish Parliament.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): I said no such thing.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have not the words here. I do not mean to say that he had intended to do so, but that the fact of the introduction of the Home Rule schemes had made the government of Ireland impossible. [MR. GLADSTONE dissented.] At any rate, he will acknowledge that the introduction of his schemes has made the task of the present Government, which is not in favour of those schemes, a very difficult task. We have to devote ourselves, then, in the first place, to the administration of the Irish Government. That is not a light task. In the second place, we have to devote ourselves to the careful consideration of what we can do in decentralizing Irish Government, in introducing a system of local self-government in Ireland framed on a popular basis—framed, as far as we can frame it, to meet the interests of Ireland in that matter, while being within the lines laid down by our own pledges and the desires of our constituents. Well, Sir, that is a pretty severe task for us between the present time and the ordinary meeting of Parliament next year. But that is not the whole of our policy. We are not content with that. We recognize—as I have often said speaking on the other side of the House—to the full that it is impossible that the Irish Land Question can remain in its present condition. I have always said so. The system of practically dual ownership which was established by the Act of 1881 is as impossible as a final satisfactory settlement as the copyhold system, which is not unlike it, has proved in England. We find ourselves face to face with this question. We find it intertwined with other important matters in the social state of Ireland, with the want of other employment in other industries, with the pitiable condition of much of the population on the West Coast. We have all these social matters to consider, and they have to be considered by anyone who would arrive at a proper solution of the question of Irish land. What do we propose? We propose an inquiry—an immediate inquiry—by a Commission, a small working Commission, consisting of men who, in our belief, thoroughly understand the question. [An hon. MEMBER: Who are they?] The names cannot be announced yet, especially at a time of year when some of the hardest workers are absent from the United Kingdom. We propose such an inquiry with certain definite points which my noble Friend stated to the House the other day. It is not a general inquiry into the whole of the Irish Land Question. The points have been carefully defined, and we hope and believe that the scope of the Commission is so narrowed that it will be perfectly possible for them to report in time for us to consider the facts they have ascertained and their recommendations, and decide upon any legislation which it may be our duty to submit in the coming Session of Parliament. What I want to submit is, Can we in any other way give a more practical proof of our desire to deal with this matter than by thoroughly sifting it by impartial persons? What do hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway say?

They say that it is impossible that rents in Ireland can now be paid—that they must have a Bill suspending evictions in the case of tenants under judicial rents. That view was stated in a very exaggerated form by the hon. Member for Liverpool, who told us that our policy was a decree of starvation against hundreds of thousands of Irish tenants who were not able to pay their rents. What I want is to state the real position of this question. Everybody in England, at least in the South of England, knows very well that, thanks to the great fall in the price of articles mainly produced in the South of England, the rents of arable farms have enormously decreased within the last few years. That is probably true of other parts of Great Britain; but the case is different from Ireland, as the article to which I mainly refer is wheat, and no one can say that the price of wheat has any great influence on the general state of agriculture in Ireland. My noble Friend the other night referred to two articles which have fallen largely in price in Ireland. He spoke of butter and stock. The price of these articles is a most material element in Irish agriculture. No doubt, a large and permanent fall in their prices must have a material effect on the power of the tenants to pay their rents. But this is no question of rents agreed to in the ordinary way by agreement between landlord and tenant. In such cases, I believe, the landlords generally throughout Ireland have made large remissions in the past year, and they are likely to do so in the future. My noble Friend was charged with suggesting that the Irish landlords should press their rights to the utmost. He never used a sentence which would bear that construction. The noble Lord and Her Majesty's Government would deprecate as earnestly as anyone any such action on the part of the Irish landlords; and we might do so with some force, for I think we have been reminded that there are Members of the Government who are not content with preaching, but have shown that they know how to practise. In this way there would be no difficulty in Ireland, as there had been none in England, in remedying any difficulty which tenants might find in paying their rents in the coming autumn if landlords and tenants were but free to make their bargains for themselves. But more than that, the Act of 1881 contains a provision which, if I understand it rightly, seems intended to save a tenant in such a position, not being under judicial rent, from any hardship. Under that provision a tenant whom his landlord seeks to evict may appeal to the Court for a stay of the decree of eviction until he can apply to the Land Commission for a judicial rent. The Court has to lay down certain terms upon which the decree can be stayed, and I know no reason why in this matter the Court should not act with perfect fairness as between landlord and tenant. Now, I come to another matter—the question of tenants holding under judicial rents. My noble Friend has already put before the House the position of this question. Under the Act of 1881 Commissioners were appointed, and can it be supposed that these Commissioners, who were considered amply qualified by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, fixed the judicial rents without taking into consideration the fact that the price of produce must necessarily vary? I cannot imagine that any right hon. Gentleman opposite will rise and tell us that the Commissioners were so utterly wanting in their duty as not to take that matter into consideration in fixing rents for a term of 15 years. Is this fall in the price of produce, which is now so great, only a temporary or a permanent fall? What do we find? We find, from instances I have already stated in reply to a Question, that tenants can afford, in spite of the fall in prices, to give enormous sums for the tenant right of land in Ireland. These are matters which surely deserve grave consideration, and specially by those who are responsible for the Land Act of 1881, before they undertake to say that the judicial rents were fixed so unjustly or unfairly that, when a year comes in which prices fall, as they have fallen for a short time, the cry is at once justifiable that those rents should be revised. On the other hand, Her Majesty's Government have never, from the beginning of this matter, looked upon the Commissioners who have decided rents as infallible either in their method or in their knowledge of the question. We admit that it is possible that they may have been wrong, and, therefore, we include this matter in the inquiry which we propose. It is not for me to forecast what the result of that inquiry may be on either of the two points affecting the payment of rents specified for inquiry in that Commission. It is not for me, I think, to dwell on those remarkable assertions as to our intention to charge the taxpayers with an enormous sum for the benefit of Irish landlords at the present moment. We wait the result of that inquiry; we wait to see what facts are proved; we wait to see what suggestions are made, in order to form our own opinions on them; and when we make proposals to Parliament for the granting of the £300,000,000 suggested by the hon. Member for Northampton, it will be time enough for him to make the extravagant objections of such a remarkable character which he has raised to-night. Now, I come to the final object of this land inquiry. We believe that this Irish Land Question can only be settled by the substitution of a large peasant proprietary for the present system of dual ownership. We trust that the Commission will be able to recommend some practical changes in the present law which will aid us in arriving earlier at that object. But I hope, Sir, the House will not for a moment suppose that we intend at all to give easier terms by way of advance or by way of repayment for loans from the State to landlords and tenants for the purchase of land than were given in the Act of 1885. That Act is working well. It would be cruel to hold out the slightest hope that it would be altered in that direction. It ought not to be altered, for the terms are as liberal as any Parliament in the world ever gave to promote an object of such importance. I am convinced that if it be the desire of the Irish tenants to become purchasers of their holdings on any terms, those terms, as far as this Act goes, are as favourable as they can be. But, Sir, there are matters in which, as we believe, the operation of that Act may be extended and expedited, especially in the congested districts of Ireland. An instance came before me the other day affecting an estate in the West of Ireland in one of those congested districts. The owner was willing to sell; the tenants were willing to buy. They had agreed on the terms of sale and purchase; but the Land Commissioners who were entrusted with deciding on the fitness of the transaction, owing to the nature of the district, the poverty of the land and of the tenants, felt themselves compelled to hesitate whether they would sanction it, because, as it seemed to them, unless they compelled the owner to deposit in their hands a larger proportion of the purchase money than was named in the Act, they would hardly have sufficient backing for the advance it was desired to obtain. If there be a desire, as I cannot help hoping there may be, on the part of new Local Authorities in districts such as those I have named to facilitate the working of the Act, there are more ways than one in which I can conceive, without any loss to themselves, they might give the greatest assistance, both to individuals and to the State, in expediting and extending its operations. That, therefore, is the scope of that inquiry. I have referred, I think, to all the three heads; but I would say very shortly that the whole chance to my mind of any satisfactory solution of this question, or of the restoration of any real prosperity to Ireland, must depend upon that enforcement of legal obligations without which no country can exist. When fair rents are decided, when fair terms of purchase are settled, the law must be carried out; and if it be not carried out, you cannot have confidence or security, without which it is impossible that Ireland can ever prosper. I now come to the second Commission, in regard to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt) was so sarcastic the other evening. It will be of little use, I think, to turn tenants into owners in those poor congested districts of the West of Ireland unless you can find for them and develop some means of livelihood beyond that which they can scrape out of their little holdings. Is there nothing which hon. Members below the Gangway opposite can view with favourable eyes in our suggestion that the development of the deep-sea fishing industry on the West Coast should be stimulated? I am aware that this matter has been the subject of many Commissions, of much inquiry, of frequent Reports, and also of frequent attempts to deal with it. The last attempt was made in 1883. An Act was passed allocating a sum of £250,000 of the Church Surplus towards the building or the improvement of harbours on the Coasts of Ireland for fishery purposes. I understand that the whole of that fund has now been allocated; but with rare exceptions it has been allocated to harbours which are not large enough for the large boats with which it is essential the deep-sea fishing industry should be prosecuted if it is to be prosecuted at all. I am informed, on good authority, there are as many as four or five places on the West and North Coasts of Ireland where harbours of that sort could be constructed at a comparatively small cost—nothing like the £300,000,000 mentioned by the hon. Member for Northampton—with communication by tramway or railway to existing means of communication with markets, so as to afford means for the development of those deep-sea fisheries which would be so infinitely more productive than any industry which the inhabitants of that Coast at present prosecute. Is there nothing in that view of the problem which commends itself to hon. Members? I do not say that it can be done; but I do say that I should like to see it done. People talk of emigration or migration as the sole remedy of the inhabitants of the West of Ireland. I would, if I could, infinitely prefer to leave them there and enable them to live there. I think hon. Members below the Gangway opposite will be of that opinion too. That, then, is the first head of inquiry for the second Commission. What is the next head? It is the completion of the arterial drainage of Ireland. As the hon. Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare) reminded the House the other night, much has been done and is being done in existing Acts of Parliament by the Board of Works and by Local Boards in Ireland for the improvement of the drainage of that country; but there are certain great arteries into which all the small drainage works must run which have never been properly cared for, as they ought to be if the small drainage works are to work effectively. And those great works can never—I have given great thought and consideration to the subject—be carried out solely by local enterprize, because they never can pay those locally interested in them. Is not that a question which may, and ought to be, fairly considered? If it were shown to the satisfaction of the House of Commons that a comparatively small sum—£750,000—would really complete this arterial drainage of Ireland—and on which, no doubt, some return would be obtainable for the State—if that could be shown to the satisfaction of the House of Commons, is not that a policy which hon. Members might support in the material interests of their country, and which ought not to be unacceptable to the British Parliament? Then as to the third inquiry. It has been my fate to travel a good deal about Ireland. I appeal to hon. Members from Ireland, and others who know the country, whether they know anything much worse in any part of the world than the "facilities," if I may so call them, for interchange of traffic afforded by the different Railway Companies, and the rates and fares for the conveyance of passengers? At one time it was proposed that all this should be put right by a great system of State purchase of Irish railways. I remember the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) warmly opposed any such proposition. I discussed it in 1874, when I was Irish Secretary, and I cordially concurred with the opposition which the right hon. Gentleman gave to it. But I must say that I can conceive that, if Parliament could in any way facilitate the amalgamation—compel the amalgamation of those little Irish lines, and encourage cheaper fares—an enormous advantage would be gained in the development of the commercial and industrial resources of Ireland. I may be told that this is an inquiry of great scope, and that it relates to matters dealt with by previous Commissions; what, then, is the use of a new Commission? On that point what I say is this—these matters have previously been inquired into mainly by Irish Commissions. They have often reported in favour of considerable expenditure upon them, and of proposals of various kinds; but nothing has been done, so far as I know, to carry out their suggestions. Why has it not been done? Because I am afraid there has been a sort of suspicion on the part of many hon. Members of the Imperial Parliament, that Irishmen would recommend any kind of expenditure, however useless and extravagant, provided the money were only spent in Ireland. What we want to do is to get some Commission which will go into this matter and report upon it with the highest authority to Parliament. My noble Friend informed the House that he proposed that the

Commission should be composed of experts. I should say that three men would be sufficient. They should be men of experience in engineering, in the execution of great public works, in the execution of drainage works, or in agriculture—men especially of large experience of them, not so much in Ireland as in other places. They should come to the examination of this question with all the knowledge which previous Reports of evidence places at their disposal, and with fresh and unbiased minds. They should look at it as hard-headed men of business; they should make their recommendations upon it to us; and if these recommendations should be in favour of an expenditure which to them would be considered practical and useful, why, to my mind, I think it is impossible to exaggerate the value of the backing such a recommendation would give to any Government in urging the acceptance of such proposals. Now, Sir, I hope I have said something to show to the House that what we mean by these Commissions is not delay, but real business. We want to do something in a matter which urgently requires to be dealt with—namely, the Irish Land Question. We want to put an end, if we can, to those interminable series of Reports, coupled with inaction, in those matters so intimately connected with the development of the material and industrial resources of Ireland. And, Sir, may I not hope that on further consideration hon. Members from Ireland will perhaps not view that policy as quite so ridiculous as they appear to regard it now? I quite admit that we are not offering them that which is the main and paramount object of their desire. I quite admit that when we are proposing to decentralize the system of Irish Government, to remodel local government in Ireland on popular lines, we are attempting a work which is not the constituting of a separate Irish Government and a separate Irish Parliament, and we do not make those proposals with the slighest idea—we are not so foolish as to suppose—that such proposals would in any way satisfy their great desire and demand. But what I would, in all deference, ask them to do is to consider these questions a little apart. They cannot have, for the present at any rate, that separate Government and Parliament which they want. Are they not, in the meantime, to do anything for the benefit of their country? What we ask is that the Imperial Parliament should help us in forwarding the national prosperity of Ireland, in doing something to remedy its social grievances. Will the Irish Members not, so far as they can in accordance with their opinions, give us their help in a work which is surely for the benefit of their country? I have detained the House already, I fear, too long. I have been anxious, first, to strip our proposals of that veil of exaggeration which has been thrown over them by so many speakers; and, secondly, to impress upon the House that what we mean is real action, and that it is in no spirit of delay, but, on the contrary, in our desire to do something, that my noble Friend expounded his policy to the House the other evening, and that I am attempting, however feebly, to reproduce and expand it to-night. We shall endeavour to the best of our power to carry out the views we have expressed, and we appeal earnestly for the support of hon. Members, to whatever political Party they may belong, in that labour. So far as we are concerned, we take our stand, in the first place, on the maintenance of the Union. That is the decision which the constituencies of this country have come to. That it is our duty to maintain within the lines of our own pledges, in accordance with the votes we have given and the speeches we have made in this House. But within those lines we will do our best for those great interests that are committed to our charge, in the hope that our tenure of Office may show that we shall leave Ireland in a more peaceful, more prosperous, and more orderly condition than that in which, unfortunately, we now find it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said, that, in his opinion, further debate would be useful if it provoked some explanation from the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). In answer to the appeal that had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), he (Mr. Bradlaugh) had no hesitation in charging the responsibility for the blood that had been recently shed in Belfast upon the speeches of the noble Lord the Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill); for he had led the Orangemen to believe that they had a right to resort to arms. It ill became the present Government to complain that they were unduly charged with inciting to outrage, when the House had the record of those speeches before it. It would be in the recollection of hon. Members who sat in the last Parliament that he (Mr. Bradlaugh) had drawn the attention of the House to one speech of the noble Lord, immediately on its delivery, as being likely to induce ignorant men to resort to such use of rifles and revolvers as might result in loss of life. The noble Lord offered no correction or explanation; and though it might be possibly said that his (Mr. Bradlaugh's) position as a private Member was not sufficient to require an answer, he would remind the House that the right hon. Gentleman the then Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had also gravely emphasized the comment he (Mr. Bradlaugh) had ventured to offer, and the noble Lord had never suggested that his language had been misrepresented or misconstrued. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had described what had been put before the House as a plain policy. That was the only word of description that seemed utterly inapplicable to it. He (Mr. Bradlaugh) wanted, however, to know what the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale had to say about the scheme of local self-government on popular lines in Ireland that had been propounded. The noble Marquess owed it to the country to say whether he had modified his views upon that subject, or whether he was going to support the Conservative Government in what they proposed. Had the views of the noble Marquess as to the functions of the State changed? Or was it the function of the State to do this and that for the people of Ireland which he did not think it the function of the State to do for the people of England? The House had a right to know, also, from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who had done so much to instal the Conservatives in Office, what he thought of some of the proposals of the Government with regard to Ireland? In a verbal sense it was not quite untrue that the country had decisively pronounced against a Statutory Parliament for Ireland; but in a very real sense it was quite untrue, because the great bulk of the constituencies had been acted upon, not so much by the question of the Statutory Parliament for Ireland, as by the proposal to buy out Irish landlords at the expense of the British taxpayer. They had been told that the country had pronounced against the proposals of the late Prime Minister; but that pronouncement had been indistinct, and would not be decisive, because, even in the ranks of the Conservatives themselves, there would be difficulties when the English taxpayers were told that the present Government meant to bribe the Irish landlords at their expense. With regard to the proposal to deal with judicial rents, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had told them that it was possible that those rents might be found to have been imposed at a higher rate than the condition of the tenant would allow him to pay, but that it was a gross exaggeration to say that the present Government intended to burden the British taxpayer with reference to this. But he (Mr. Bradlaugh) thought that there was a distinct declaration on the part of the present Government that if the Commissioners were found to have blundered in fixing the rent the case was one in which the burden ought not to fall upon the landlord, but upon the State. But what was the State? The State was made up of the taxpayers of the country; and this proposal meant that they were to ask artizans, such as the Cannock Chase miners, who since Christmas had been getting about 16*s.* a-week, to pay the Irish landlord because a blunder had been made, and on the supposition that the landlord had been given more than he ever ought to have got. Then, what was the reason of the disturbance of social order in Belfast, apart from the reasons which he had previously alluded to? One of the reasons was that the Conservative Party had taught the leaders of the Protestants of Belfast that they would afford them special protection and aid as in the past; and it was that that had led to the disturbance. It was a part of that unfortunate and persistent policy which had always been on the side of the garrison of landlords against the unfortunate Roman Catholic tenantry. With regard to the sending of Sir Redvers Buller to Ireland, if he was simply sent to administer the law, for his own part he (Mr. Bradlaugh) did not think that military Generals were usually found to be profound legists. But if Sir Redvers Buller was going to exercise special powers, then let the Government declare it to Parliament. They heard now that £750,000 would complete the arterial drainage of Ireland. If the Government thought that that money ought to be spent, let them ask Parliament for authority; it would be better even to throw away that sum than to have another winter of crime. But, in his opinion, the Local Authorities in Ireland best knew how to spend the money; it was not the duty of Parliament to deal with these things in this fashion. They were likely in this way only to render the population more helpless; it would be far better to let them have the opportunity of helping themselves. The right hon. Gentleman complained that he had been charged with proposing inquiries solely for the purpose of delay and for the purpose of holding Office. For his own part, he knew that the Office which the right hon. Gentleman held was one which no one would wish to hold except under a strong sense of duty, and he did not make that charge against the right hon. Gentleman; but if it were not somewhat for the purpose of delay, it would have only been necessary to walk into the Library of the House, where all the necessary information was already contained in Blue Books. In the Records now in the Library, taken on sworn evidence before Commissioners, there was already ample information as to the material condition of the people of Ireland as to drainage, and so forth. It was not a real inquiry that was sought; but, under cover of inquiry, the Government wanted to drift off the evil day and to escape from the responsibilities of their position. What was it that the Government proposed? They heard of decentralization; did that mean abolishing the Castle, or was it only a pretty word? Did local self-government on a popular basis only mean that it was to be on a basis popular with hon. Gentlemen who sat behind the Government and supported them with their votes? If the proposal really meant a strong measure of local self-government on a popular basis, then it meant something to which the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale objected, and with regard to which the great bulk of the Conservative Party would have been horrified if they had been compelled to vote for it if brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. As to the condition of the West Coast of Ireland, there were pages and pages of evidence from Irishmen already in existence in Blue Books as to what land should be cultivated, how it should be treated, and with regard to the drainage question as well; and yet now the present Parliament was asked to have a Royal Commission, in order that the Government might be prepared to bring in legislation on the subject? What were the tenants to do in the meanwhile? Were they to go on starving? The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland told them that the tenant who did not hold under a judicial rent might appeal to a Court for delay until he could appeal to the Land Court. But in the case of a tenant who only paid £2 or £3 of rent the cost of the initial appeal would very likely amount to more than his rent. Everybody knew the state of the matter except the Members of the Conservative Cabinet, and they were going to make an inquiry—an inquiry which would only add another to the many which had ended in nothing. In connection with railways the Government proposed to compel cheaper fares. He was glad of that, because he believed that by railway rates in this country British produce was unfairly handicapped. But what would the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale say to that? At the General Election there was not a word about such a proposal. The Government did not know what their legislation was to be, and so they were to have a number of experts to inquire into the matter. The Government believed that the Land Question could be solved only by the creation of a peasant proprietary, if there was a desire on the part of the new Local Authorities to facilitate it. But who were to be the new Local Authorities? They were merely men in buckram, men of whom the House knew nothing. Were the peasant proprietorships to be created for the benefit of the landlord at the cost of the State? In that case they would have to enact that there should be an Irish peasant proprietary at the expense of England

and the working men of England. The true remedy was for Ireland to redress her own grievances in her own Parliament by Members elected by her own people.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Newington, W.) said, that listening to some of the speeches in the debate would convey the impression that one was sitting in the last Parliament, and that Home Rule was still an open question. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to regard that question as still before the country. The policy of Her Majesty's Government, as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the first night of the re-assembling of Parliament, and as amplified by the Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night, was divided into three heads—social order, the Land Question, and local government. The restoration of social order was clearly the first duty of every Government. It simply meant that every man should be permitted to go about his business when and as he pleased, and that in the fulfilment of any contract into which he might have entered he should not be hindered by the action of others. It was objected to the policy of Her Majesty's Ministers that they did not intimately connect their measures for the restoration of social order with remedial measures. But no remedial measures could possibly take effect until social order was first established. The late Prime Minister did not always object to the restoration of social order by itself, for, speaking at Edinburgh about two years ago, he said that social difficulties or disorder destroyed the peace and comfort of private life and broke up the relations of classes and families, and he took credit to his Lord Lieutenant, Lord Spencer, for having then so far, separately and independently, grappled with the difficulties of social order. The Land Question was, if he might use the expression, complicated by its simplicity. The cultivation of the land was the only employment open to the people of Ireland. Without the land they could not live. The landlords, as a body, were impoverished and were willing to sell. In England, or in any other country except Ireland, the landlords would have a chance of finding rich merchants, professional men, and others, anxious to buy and to develop the resources of the land by the application of capital. The result of the proposals of hon. Members opposite was that the only possible purchasers of Irish land were the present tenants; and by a system of intimidation those tenants were prevented, even when they were willing to purchase on fair terms, from paying their rent in order that the selling value of the land might be forced down to almost nothing. The fact was that the Irish National Party were endeavouring to organize a gigantic "knock-out," by which they might get the land without paying a fair price for it. This attempt was manifestly unjust towards the landowners, and ought to be put a stop to. It was this state of things that the Act of 1881 was passed for the purpose of averting, and in order to secure a greater solidity of the social state in Ireland. An endeavour was now being made to set aside the provisions of that Act on the ground that the depression of agricultural prices was so great that it was impossible for the tenants to pay their rent; but it must not be forgotten that in the last Parliament, when Irish Members wished to obtain an advance of British capital, they maintained that the Irish tenants were well able to pay a fair rent, and pay it regularly, and that, therefore, the security offered for the advance was a good one. In these circumstances the Irish Members could hardly be credited with sincerity when they turned round and contended that the tenants were now unable to pay a reasonable rent. It was the duty of Her Majesty's Government therefore, in the first place, to take such action as would put an end to the system of intimidation which had been organized for the purpose of preventing the payment of rents, and the consequent depreciation in the selling value of the land; and, in the second, to bring together the would-be sellers and the would-be buyers, so that they might conduct their transactions through the agency of the State. It had been objected that any proposal put forward by the Conservative Party having for its object the transfer of the Irish land from the landlords to the tenants must of necessity partake of the characteristics of the second Bill of the late Government. If that were the case it did not lie in the mouths of hon. Members opposite to object to it. The two main objections to the second Bill of the late Government put forward by the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) were, first, that it had been offered as a bribe to the landlords to induce them to swallow the principle of Home Rule which they hated; and, secondly, that it proposed to compel the British taxpayer to lend a large sum to what would eventually become a foreign country. Now that both those objections had been removed, there was no good ground for rejecting a fair and reasonable proposal for settling the Irish Land Question.

Mr. PINKERTON (Galway Bo.) said, the Government had expressed a desire—and he hoped a sincere desire—to get information with regard to the necessities of the Irish. The noble Lord, so far as he was concerned, did not require any information. He had evidently made up his mind and prejudged the case. One of the most impartial of the Irish Sub-Commissioners had declared he had no intention of considering the agricultural depression, or of allowing it to influence his mind in the slightest degree in fixing judicial rents. If this were a depression of a temporary character, he would say that was a very upright judicial decision; but if the downward tendency of prices continued for nine or ten years, he held that the rents fixed on that principle were unjust and iniquitous to the tenants of Ireland. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had intimated that an arbitrary combination had interfered with and hampered the free action of the Land Act of 1881, and that this Royal Commission would have power to inquire how far that action had been hampered by that combination. He was glad it was the intention of the Government to open up this question, as he believed it would fall within the scope of this inquiry to find out how many of the tenants had been examined by the Select Committee of the House of Lords. The statement of the noble Lord attributing the depression to slovenly and careless manufacture would have the effect of injuring the people of Ireland, by depreciating their staple commodities in the eyes of the English consumers. He knew that the tenants of Ireland were all suffering from the agricultural depression; but the most depressed and down-trodden portion of the tenants were the unfortunate leaseholders. The Government had no intention of dealing honestly with the Irish Question if the first act of their official career was not to remove this bar from the leaseholders. He had always found, unfortunately, that the revaluation of the land meant an increase in the rent, and he was sorry to hear the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer express a desire for a revaluation of the land of Ireland. He would prefer a hundred times the Land Act, with all its defects, to a revaluation of the land. He held that the best possible guarantee for the Government was a purchase on fair terms. He considered it was very dishonest for an hon. Member to say that the British taxpayers would be at the risk of losing their money. There was not the slightest danger of that. There was not a road in Ireland but had been made by the efforts of the tenants; there was not a bridge but had been built by the tenants' efforts; and in many cases the railways had been made by their own sole and unaided efforts. He might instance the case of the Derry Central Railway, the interest on the borrowed money for which had been paid by the tenant farmers of the County Derry, owing to the manipulation of the Grand Jury, and the tenants had paid thousands of pounds for the non-existent navigation of the River Bann, which flooded their lands. The only local authority which could properly carry out public works in Ireland was a Central Government properly appointed by the Irish people. He did not attribute the riots in Belfast to the language of the Chancellor of the Exchequer or any other individual. The riots were caused by the excitement and encouragement of the Conservatives, both lay and clerical. There was not a fife and drum band in the North of Ireland that was not wearing a uniform purchased by some Conservative candidate at the last Election; there was not a Member who had the misfortune of belonging to the same semi-political religious association as the hon. Member for South Belfast, but had the gospel of peace upon his lips and murder and outrage in his heart, fostering and encouraging strife. If Home Rule had been passed, outrage and riot would have been impossible in the town of Belfast. Every man in the country would have been a special constable to maintain order. If the outside influences were removed, he was perfectly satisfied the Orangemen would be the extreme Democratic Party of the Irish Parliament, and in the time to come he believed they would be the most ardent Home Rulers in Ireland. He hoped to have the honour to see the hon. Member for South Belfast leading a powerful contingent of Democratic Orangemen in the National Parliament in Dublin. He was not ashamed to belong to a Party that was subsidized by what was termed foreign gold; but he certainly would be ashamed to belong to a Party that would pocket the earnings of the servant girls and labouring men of America in the shape of an unjust rent.

MR. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) said, they had heard a great deal from the other side of the House about "the verdict of the country," which had been described as "final and irreversible." Well, if they had had as much experience of verdicts as he (Mr. Shirley) had, they would not think so much of them. He (Mr. Shirley) had no respect at all for a verdict. Verdicts were often obtained by the employment of unfair arts and artifices, and by the tricks and dodges of unscrupulous advocates. That was how the verdict had been obtained at the recent General Election. It had been obtained by confusing the issue and muddling the jury. He ventured to say that if the issue had not been confused, and the jury not muddled, the result would have been very different. He did not believe that the electors would have declared against the naked principle of a subordinate Parliament for Ireland. But the scheme had been complicated by the enormous cost which it was said it would cost the British taxpayer. He, for one, had been very plain and distinct on that point. He had not hesitated to tell the electors of the Doncaster Division that he did not approve of the late Prime Minister's plan of buying out the Irish landlords, and that in no event would he vote for such a plan unless he was satisfied that his constituents wished him to do so. He might say that he believed he owed his seat this time to the fact that he had deliberately thrown over all the details and provisions of the late Prime Minister's Bill, and fought the election simply on the principle of a subordinate Parliament. He had even gone so far as to say that he should have no objection to Ulster being entirely excluded from the scheme, if that were found desirable. The principal Conservative newspaper in his district, *The Yorkshire Post*, had been so struck by the bold manner in which he had fought his election on the principle, and not the details, of the Home Rule Bill, that on the day before his polling it came out with an article charging him with the expression of Liberal Unionist, and not Gladstonian, opinions. They were now told by their opponents that their policy was one of inquiry. That was a transparent device to gain time, inasmuch as the materials for forming a judgment were ready to hand. If he might conclude with a word of advice to his Irish Friends below the Gangway, it was that they should be patient and forbearing at this juncture. He hoped they would not use violent language inside or outside Parliament, but would do their best to prevent outrage and to restrain the passions of their countrymen. Everything depended on their moderation. If they acted in such a spirit, the English people would be with them, and would by-and-bye, if not immediately, give them the Parliament they so much wished for. For himself, he believed firmly that a frank and generous recognition of Irish nationality, with due regard to the integrity, the dignity, and the glory of the British Empire, was the only way of solving the most difficult problem of the day.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, North) said, the Government had stated that no Business should be taken except that which the Government considered absolutely essential. He considered that, looking at the state of things that existed in Ireland, that was a very extraordinary statement. Were they to wait until February or March in order to set right the riotous state of things that at present existed in Belfast; and were they to wait until then for a remedy for the impending evictions all over Ireland? He considered that the latter question was one that demanded the prompt and immediate attention of the House. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman), in moving the Address, very candidly—and perhaps too candidly for his Party—foreshadowed the policy of the Government. He stated that the Government proposed to exercise a firm and impartial administration of the law, and he also stated that the agrarian question was at the root of the Irish difficulty. He inferred from the double statement that they were to be treated to a dose of the long-promised "manacles or Manitoba." It was clear, from what had fallen from the speakers on the Government side of the House, that the Government meant to enforce impossible rents; and if that were allowed to continue during the winter it was very hard to imagine what serious results might arise. Hence he contended that it was the duty of the Government to seek measures to prevent the consequences that were likely to arise from the continuance of evictions. If the people gave any physical opposition to the enforcement of these impossible rents, that would be what the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer chiefly desired, for he would then have reason, according to his own view, to come to the House and demand an enlargement of the powers he already possessed. Such a policy was coercion in its fullest import. It seemed to be the settled determination of the Government that whoever suffered in Ireland the landlords should not suffer; for the noble Lord had stated clearly that if the tenants could not pay the rents, the nation—the British public—should pay, and should be called upon to make good the unavoidable shortcomings of the Irish people. He had watched the tabulated Reports of the judicial rents, and had found, especially during the past year, that the rents had been fixed at 50 per cent under the nominal rents. He was, therefore, entitled to say that the Commissioners were now fixing rents on a totally different scale from that on which they fixed them two years ago; and if the Government insisted that the tenants who were paying the higher judicial rents should continue to pay them a great injustice would be done and trouble and danger would result. This, no doubt, was the state of things which the Government desired to bring about; but the Irish people did not wish to give them the chance. Nevertheless, while they were prepared to pay rents that were just, they were equally prepared to resist the payment of rents which they felt they were unable to pay. The price of produce had fallen fully 50 per cent, and in Munster butter which three years ago fetched 1*s*. and 1*s*. 2*d*. per lb. could at the present time be bought for 6*d*. and 7*d*. That was a state of things which was not due to any deterioration in the quality of the article or fault in manufacture, but was due to the extensive and unrestricted importation of butterine into the country. The proposed Commissions were merely pretexts for delay; and such a policy, requiring, as the noble Lord said, "immense deliberation," was sure to end in failure. As to the Belfast Commission, he asked whether it would inquire into the cause and origin of the riots; it seemed to him that the noble Lord who fomented those riots was the doctor who was now called in to prescribe the remedy. In conclusion, he contended that the only solution of all the difficulties was to allow the people of Ireland to govern themselves.

MR. JENNINGS (Stockport): Mr. Speaker, no one can have listened carefully to the contributions made to this debate from the opposite side of the House without being struck with one fact above all others. It is that the majority of Members there do not seem to have realized the meaning and force of the decision which the country has recently pronounced. They appear to think that the situation is precisely as it was last June. They even mix up the present Government in some strange way with the last. The last Government came into power by virtue of an understanding with the Leaders of the Nationalist Party, under which they were bound to produce a scheme of Home Rule. The Irish Members seem to think that they have the present Government in the same way under their command; and in that they are, to some extent, supported by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), who argued the other night as if the Government were under a solemn compact to produce some plan modelled on his own. "A fair time ought to be allowed them," he said; "but that time ought not to be unnecessarily prolonged." All this, I venture to submit, shows an utter misconception of the present position of affairs.

One of the followers of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) said the other night—"We have been returned with a mandate to demand a National Parliament in Dublin." Exactly; but we here, and a large majority of this House, have been returned with a mandate to oppose that demand—to oppose it, no matter from whom it proceeds, or by what means it may be enforced: 392 Members of this House have been expressly charged to vote against all schemes involving disunion and independent Parliaments. There are only 84 elected to support out-and-out the schemes of the right hon. Gentleman. His regular followers managed to secure their seats—those of them who did so—by assuring their constituents that the twin Bills were dead and buried; that they could never be revived; and that they would never vote for them, even if they were revived. ["Oh, oh!"] Why, Irish Members do not seem to be aware even of that. They do not seem to know that the right hon. Gentleman himself went down to his constituents and declared that the Bills were dead, and this official announcement was received with rapturous applause. The nation intends that these Bills shall remain dead; and not all the skill and adroitness of the right hon. Gentleman will be able to bring them to life again. And now the Irish Members coolly expect the present Government to take up the scheme which has been solemnly condemned by the nation. They ask when the new Ministry will produce its policy. ["Hear, hear!"] Why, it has produced it. It produced it here on Thursday night, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer emphatically stated that the Government meant to maintain the Union, and to restore law and order in Ireland. Again, to-night, the Chief Secretary for Ireland has distinctly repeated that declaration. That is the work which the country looks to them to perform; and we are sent here to support them in doing it. "The question of the hour," said the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) on Thursday, "is that of Ireland." But the working men of England are resolved that other questions equally important shall now have their turn; and they object to the whole time of Parliament being given up to Ireland, Session after Session, with this result only—that Ireland is infinitely more disturbed, and more difficult to deal with to-day, than it was when the right hon. Gentleman launched out upon his fatal Irish policy in 1868. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) cast a great deal of ponderous ridicule upon the statement of the Government that it intended to deal with social order as a separate question. He caused it to be understood that he intends to be faithful to his new allies—at any rate, while they can be useful to him. But these very allies he has formerly denounced as the deadliest enemies of social order. In 1882, in introducing the severest Coercion Bill of modern times, he declared that the Party led by the hon. Member for Cork was "a cancerous sore in Ireland"—a sore "which springs from the baneful venom of secret societies and unlawful combinations." "To that foul disease," he went on to say, "it is necessary that the surgeon's knife should be applied. We have to cauterize and extirpate it." It will, of course, be understood that when those words were uttered, the right hon. Gentleman did not foresee that the Party he proposed to extirpate would one day be strong enough to make him Chancellor of the Exchequer. No doubt, he found it much more congenial to his feelings and temperament to hold Office under their patronage than to quake night and day before them, and to live surrounded by a squad of police. But before he succumbed he told this House—on the 9th of March, 1881—that the whole of the agitation carried on by the Land League "was Fenianism under another name; it was aiming at the same end by the same means." Whether that is so or not I do not at present inquire. Circumstances may one day compel this House to look into that question; but what we have at present before us is the fact that the right hon. Gentleman the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer pledges himself to the statement that Fenianism and the National League are identical in their operations and aims. This connection, no doubt, accounted for the triumphant glee with which he announced on the 3rd of February, 1881, that he had ordered the arrest of a celebrated Fenian, and founder of the National League, Michael Davitt. He was then all for preserving order, "by itself," or in any other way. He flourished his surgeon's knife over the heads of the hon. Member for Cork and his followers in that genial manner which we all admire. He wanted to be operating upon the "cancerous sore" without intermission. We know what produced his change of attitude toward these Gentlemen. It was his deep affection for Ireland. Referring to the repeated concessions made to Irish demands, the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer told us the other night that if they had failed it was because we had "mistaken the symptoms." That, he seems to think, is an excellent guarantee for the future success of himself and his Colleagues—that throughout their treatment of the disease they have mistaken the symptoms. Accept their remedies now, and what ground have we for supposing that they will not come forward again, when the "last link" between England and Ireland has been broken, with the cool avowal that they mistook the symptoms? What reparation will it be possible to make then for the disastrous blunder? The symptoms in this case have never varied. They were openly revealed by the hon. Member for Cork in his celebrated Cincinnati speech, the authenticity of which has been proved as much as anything in this world can be. He said—

> "None of us, whether we are in America, or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

Again, on the 5th of December, 1880, he said at Waterford—

> "Before a very long time has elapsed, perhaps much sooner than any of us expect now, the people of Ireland will be enabled to enter for the first time on the paths of prosperity and national independence."

So, too, at the Dublin Convention of the Land League in September, 1881, one of the speakers declared that the

> "Land League had struck down and would ultimately destroy landlordism in Ireland, and with it British rule."

That has been and is the only symptom of the disease which it is important to watch. The recent Fenian and Nationalist Convention at Chicago kept it in the background, but could not keep it out of sight. At the final meeting an ex-Member of this House, Mr. W. O'Brien, said—

> "We have told Englishmen candidly that to English rule in Ireland we are, and will for ever remain, irreconcilable."

[*Cheers from the Home Rulers.*] Ah, but you (the Irish Members) denied that when you were appealing to the country lately. We told the people it was so; but you and the Liberals stoutly contradicted it. Now you endorse Mr. O'Brien's statement. The country will know what to think of that. Now let us go on with this speech of Mr. O'Brien—

> "Upon the day when the flag of English domination in Ireland," he said, "is hauled down—then we may be forgiven—the day for holding us to an enforced and detested Union is gone for ever."

[*Slight Home Rule cheers.*] You do not cheer that so much; you are taking the alarm. Mr. O'Brien is letting out the secrets too fast. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian seems, at one time, to have perceived clearly enough what the truth was, for he declared at Liverpool, on the 27th of October, 1881, that the Party led by the hon. Member for Cork simply aimed at marching "through rapine to disintegration and dismemberment of the Empire." The operations which go on in Ireland or in this country might easily be checked, if it were not for the tremendous vantage-ground possessed by the Party of disunion in the United States. I have once before ventured to warn the House that it is from that quarter they must look for the greatest danger, and assuredly the danger does not diminish. The Irish in America are becoming more proficient every day in the art of combination for political purposes. At one time they acted exclusively with the Democratic Party; but they have seen how much more remunerative a game it is to give their support to the highest bidder. Hence, Messrs. Sullivan and Egan controlled their followers at the last Presidential Election in favour of the Republican candidate (Mr. Blaine), and, apparently, they intend to do the same again. This accounts for the fact that Governor Oglesby, of Illinois, a very influential Republican, attended one of the meetings recently at Chicago, and made a speech. The growing power of the Irish in America may be thought by some to constitute an argument for the adoption of the schemes of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. But what the Irish-Americans want is separation—England turned neck and crop out of Ireland—

and they will never be content with less. Everybody who has come into contact with the Leaders of the Irish-Americans knows this to be true. And it would be far better to concede separation, with all its responsibilities and dangers for Ireland, than to go through the farce of setting up a Parliament in Ireland, only to see it used as an instrument to force separation from us afterwards. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby stated here, on Friday night, that the "Land League grew from infancy to manhood under a Tory Administration." That is an inaccuracy which one who is supposed to be a great historical authority ought to have avoided. The Land League was born only in 1879, the very last year of Lord Beaconsfield's Administration. It grew to manhood under the Administration of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. It was also under that Administration that "Boycotting" took its rise. "Boycotting" was never heard of till October, 1880. It was also under a Liberal Administration that the National League grew from infancy to manhood. For all these "cancerous sores" we are indebted to the Liberal Party and Liberal Governments. There are two points which the right hon. Gentleman owes it to the public to clear up. First, did he state the truth in 1881, when he declared that the Land League was doing the work of Fenianism, and was pursuing the same end by the same means? And, secondly, does he hold that opinion now? If he does, his present condition—stewing in a certain kind of juice which I need not particularly specify—is calculated to increase that peculiar reputation which he justly enjoys. That the Nationalists should fail to comprehend the facts which they have now to face is not altogether surprising. It seems to be very difficult at all times for them to discriminate between romance and reality. [*Laughter.*] Well, I like to prove what I say, and I will give one very striking instance of this congenital incapacity to tell truth from fiction. Take but one instance. They succeeded in pursuading themselves last June that they had, at least, 40 or 50 Conservative seats in English boroughs comfortably tucked away in their pockets. Their Leader, the hon. Member for Cork, said to a correspondent of *The New York Herald* (June 20, 1886)—

> "We have the undoubted fact that by the Irish votes in Great Britain which were given at the General Election to the Conservatives we can transfer at least 50 seats now held by the Tories to the Liberal Party. This will make 100 on division, and will convert the majority of 30 against the Bill into a majority of 70 for it."

Of course, the hon. Member did not mean to deceive *The New York Herald;* he merely fell a victim to that Oriental wealth of imagination which is the birthright of every Irishman. It will be in the recollection of the House that a similar Arabian Nights' tale was related here last Session by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). He believed fully in it. What was more serious, he pursuaded the Government of the day to believe in it, and it helped to lure them to their ruin. Many hon. Members must remember the great night of the startling revelations about perfidious Tories who had been elected by Irish votes, when the hon. Member came down with a roll of MS. big enough to contain the history of the universe. We remember his thrilling tones, his portentous demeanour; I recall the alarming manner in which he suddenly stretched out a grisly forefinger at me, and beckoned me to follow him. When I refused, he placed the mark of doom upon my forehead, and, with 40 or 50 others, I was ordered for execution at the polls. Sir, I believe we are all, or nearly all, sitting very comfortably before you at this moment, whilst those who opposed us on the lines of the National League are left out in the cold. The hon. Member said last Friday night that his Colleagues, not being opposed in Ireland, "were left free to go and instruct English constituencies in the discharge of their duties at the recent elections." That is quite true; they did so. One of them—and one of the ablest of them, the hon. Member for East Mayo—(Mr. Dillon)—was sent down to the constituency which I have the honour to represent. He pleaded the cause of the National League against me with so much ability that I was sent back here by a much larger majority than before. What proportion of the £65,000 which Mr. Egan, of the Clan-na-Gael and the National League, says has been forwarded to his friends here was forwarded to Stockport I do not know; but it was a very bad investment for the National

League. My constituents overthrew the League in their borough, in spite of its boasted 800 or 900 votes, and declared themselves in favour of maintaining unimpaired the Dominions of their Sovereign. They do not belong to the titled class whom the right hon. Gentleman opposite so bitterly denounces, and to whom he has been the means of making more additions than any man alive. They are only working men; but they see through and understand this question far better than those who call themselves great and wise. They have had enough, for the time at any rate, of Irish threats, and of craven surrender to those threats; enough, too, of moonstruck visions of "final settlements," hatched in the over-heated brains of great orators. What they want now is a period of rest from political agitation; they expect to see the claims of Englishmen to justice and fair treatment receive some little consideration. They think that Irishmen practically have a Parliament all to themselves now, and wonder what on earth they can want with another. They ask that something should be done for their declining and menaced industries; that, among other things, the Government should endeavour to open up new markets for our goods in other parts of the world. They ask for—and I believe that their fellow working men everywhere are determined to have—a firm and settled Government, the suppression of lawlessness wherever it may be found, the vindication of the law, and the security to every man of his right to take his labour into any market that he pleases, and to be entirely free in all his relations with his fellow-men. This is what the country requires; and I gather from the firm utterances of the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night, and from those of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night, that the Government have made up their minds that the country shall not be disappointed. In that case, I believe they will receive such a measure of support as will enable them to withstand the National League, even though it be reinforced by the Sir Lucius O'Trigger of the Liberal Party.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) said, that Lancashire was a very large county, and at one time it counted for a great deal in the forward movements in great questions in this country. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Jennings), who preceded him, had said that the working classes of Lancashire were anxious that the House of Commons should address itself to those great questions which concerned the working classes; and then he complained that the House was continually and perpetually engaged in dealing with the Irish Question. But surely the hon. Member could not have been present when the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke the other night, and endorsed what the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian said on the question of the hour. He did not see that hon. Gentlemen had much cause to congratulate themselves on in the change of Government; for although there was a change of *personnel* of the Administration, still the dreary task lay before them of grappling with and settling the Irish Question. It was true that the country, on a first appeal, had decided against the policy of the late Prime Minister; but it was well known that all the reforms which were worth having in the past had not been obtained until after several appeals had been made to the electors of the country. The Liberal Party, therefore, were not in present circumstances discouraged; they were in good heart. What was it that led to the defeat of the late Government? It was assumed that it was simply the question of Home Rule for Ireland. He ventured to say that the Land Question had quite as much to do with the reduction of the Liberal majority at the last Election. It was not the Tory strength that led to the change, but it was those weak, timid, partially-informed men on this side of the House, and the gentlemen in the country who act with them. The change was also largely due to the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) and to the influence exercised also by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). Those were the Gentlemen who had handed over to the Conservative Party for the time the government of the country. He would refer hon. Gentlemen to certain notable characteristics of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill); for in Opposition his proceedings were characterized by the utmost recklessness, causing his Friends to tremble on numberless occasions.

Was there any other Gentleman in the House who could rival the noble Lord in the tone and spirit in which he addressed the people of Belfast? Then the noble Lord issued an address to his constituents, and he thought it was admitted on all hands that the address was unique. There was no other hon. Member who would have followed the style or adopted the strength of language of the noble Lord. The noble Lord had, therefore, the qualification in Opposition of utter recklessness. The noble Lord would probably have to struggle with the Irish difficulty, and he was not at all disposed to quarrel with the Government for asking that they should be allowed till February for the deliberation and consideration of their policy regarding Ireland. It might be inferred from this long delay that the Government did not understand the Irish Question; but when they were in Opposition they seemed to understand every phase of the Irish Question. *The Times* itself had lately indicated serious misgivings as to the firmness of the views that the noble Lord had lately expressed, and whether he would not be instrumental in giving Home Rule to Ireland. He was himself disposed to think that, after a short experience, a great majority of the people of this country would come to the conclusion that the Government was mainly interested in the welfare of the landlord class in Ireland, and that the great object of their Irish policy would be the emancipation of the landlords from their present difficulties. The landlords were their clients, their favourites, and the victims of their policy would be found to be the Irish tenants. He ventured to predict that if the proposal of the late Government did not find acceptance with the country, any proposal of the present Government, on the lines indicated by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would meet with much less favour at the hands of the Democracy of the country. The Tory Government was for the moment supreme in that House by the assistance of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington); but he ventured to think that the noble Marquess would not be able to carry many of those who had hitherto acted with him if the proposals sketched out by the Government were seriously followed. Between this time and February the people would receive a good deal of enlightenment upon the proposals of the Government, and it would be seen that the object of the Tory Party would be to destroy the work of the late Liberal Administration, and that they were likely to deal with the Irish Question in a way by which Ireland certainly could not benefit. He was pleased to hear the statements of the Irish Members that they would not listen to the Government bribes; but while he was content to wait till February, he hoped there would not then be any dilly-dallying or delay, and that the Government would not screen themselves behind a Commission, but that upon their own responsibility they would bring forward a properly-matured scheme to deal with the Irish Question. He anticipated that the majority of the people of Great Britain, as well as Ireland, would soon adopt the position taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, and that his proposal, or something substantially the same as his, would ultimately succeed.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON (Lancashire, Rossendale): Sir, at an earlier period of the evening the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) interested and amused the House by some observations and speculations as to the position of the Liberal Party, and especially that section of the Liberal Party with which I happen to be particularly connected. I did not hear a great deal which fell from the hon. Gentleman which appeared to call for any very serious notice. But, Sir, as that hon. Gentleman addressed a few questions to me, and to some with whom I have acted, perhaps the House will allow me to make one or two very brief observations upon what he said on that point. It seems to me that the House of Commons is scarcely the place where it is most convenient that the future position and prospects of a political Party, and still less the future position and prospects of a particular section of a political Party, should be discussed. If it is necessary that the prospects of the Liberal Unionists should be discussed any further, I think that discussion might most properly be continued in the pages of those journals where it has already been so ably discussed by the hon. Gentleman. Or, if it is necessary that the discussion should not be confined to newspapers, but should take place *vivâ voce,* it might, perhaps, be more profitably relegated to that meeting of the Liberal Federation which the hon. Member is desirous to hold, and at which the sentence of excommunication upon myself and those with whom I have acted is finally to be passed. I may, however, say that I am not aware by whom any claim has been put forward that we represent any exclusive or disproportionate share of the intelligence of the Liberal Party, or that anyone with authority to speak in the name of myself and those with whom I have acted has ever, in any degree, claimed that we are the sole Representatives of Liberalism, either in this House or in the country. What, I believe, we have claimed, and what we shall continue to claim, is that we have not forfeited our title to Liberalism, and to be considered Members of the Liberal Party, because we have been unable to accept opinions on the question of Ireland and the government of Ireland which were certainly somewhat suddenly and somewhat unexpectedly brought before the House and country — opinions which never, up to a very short time ago, had been held by any considerable section of the Party to which I belong. The hon. Member, I am sorry to say, has been most imperfectly informed of the proceedings which took place at a certain meeting, to which, unfortunately, I did not feel myself in a position to invite the hon. Gentleman. I do not know from what source the hon. Gentleman has found that at that meeting any pretension was put forward to depose my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) from the Leadership of the Liberal Party, or that any rival Leader of that Party was set up. The conclusion at which, so far as my memory serves me, that meeting arrived was one which appears, to a great extent, to be indentical to that which the hon. Member himself has formed. It was that so long as, unhappily, these differences of opinion on the question of Irish Government prevail among us, no speedy prospect of a reunion of the Liberal Party could be foreseen. We do not expect—we never have had the presumption to put forward any expectation—that either my right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition, or the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), or those who agree with him, should abandon any of the opinions or doctrines which they have recently embraced. But, at the same time, we are not prepared to sacrifice the convictions which, after considerable thought and deliberation, we, also, have formed; and we cannot subscribe to what appears to be the opinion of the hon. Member for Northampton, that, in view of the paramount object of the re-union and reconstitution of the Liberal Party, we are to abandon, as of minor importance, convictions on the subject of Ireland and the government of Ireland which we hold to be the most important subject with which any Member of the House of Commons can be called upon to deal. The hon. Member appears to imagine that the question ought to be decided for us by the fact that the proposals of the late Government have been adopted at the late Election by a majority of the Liberal Party. Sir, I cannot conceive upon what ground such a contention can be supported. Our political future, I admit, depends upon the opinion of the constituencies of this country, and amongst the constituencies of the country our political future depends, no doubt, to a very great extent, upon the opinions which may be formed, and which may be held, by the Liberal portion of those constituencies. But whatever may be the opinions formed by those constituencies, or by the Liberal portion of them, I cannot imagine or conceive that the fact that a majority of the Liberal Party in this country have embraced certain opinions, and are prepared to support certain measures, is in any way to influence the conviction which we have conscientiously formed, and which, as I have already said, we consider to be a conviction upon the most important subject which we can be called upon to discuss. Before leaving the observations of the hon. Member for Northampton, allow me to say that never, so far as I am aware, has there escaped, either from my lips or from those of any of my Friends, one word of disrespect, or one word that could be construed into a disrespectful observation, in regard to the conduct of my right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition. It would have been very far from the desire of any one of us to have imputed to my right hon. Friend that which was imputed to him by the hon. Member for Northampton this evening—namely, the imputation that he had proposed in this House, and had advocated in the country, a measure—the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill—not because he was convinced of its expediency, but that he had brought it forward and supported it simply as a bribe, in order to secure the support of the Tory landlords. Now, Sir, I understand that before the debate on the Address to Her Majesty is concluded there is a prospect that some definite issues will be submitted to the House. I do not desire, in the prospect of such definite issues being submitted to the House, to go at any length into the general discussion which has taken place; and, above all, it is not my desire to import into this debate anything which is likely to raise a fresh subject of debate, or unnecessarily to prolong it. It has not been denied that Her Majesty's Government, both in this House and in the other House, have not been slow to respond to the invitation which was addressed to them by the Leader of the Opposition, to make as full, as early, and as complete an exposition as possible of their views upon Irish policy. It has been acknowledged by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) that this exposition has been full, and that it has been definite. It consisted mainly of two parts. The Government have announced certain measures which they intend at once to take, and they have also given expression to certain opinions with reference to legislative projects which may hereafter be brought before Parliament. It is the former part of this exposition of the policy of the Government which, I think, the House will be most anxious at present to discuss, and to which it will be disposed almost entirely to confine itself. Certainly, the House cannot be expected to commit itself—and the Government would not, I think, wish the House to commit itself—to any expression whatever with regard to the principles which have been stated in reference to legislation, or legislative projects which have not yet been brought before it. These may be matters of great interest; but they are evidently subjects with which the House is not in a position at present to deal; and there is no opinion which could now be expressed, either on this side of the House or upon the other, which could in the slightest degree commit the House, or, in my opinion, greatly tend to promote a decision upon legislative projects which are not to be introduced for a very considerable period. And now as to the actual measures which the Government propose to take at present. What are the measures they are going to take? They appear to consist of the following measures:—The Government do not ask to be invested with any new or any exceptional powers; they intend to exert to the utmost the existing powers which the law has already conferred upon them; and to employ to the utmost extent the existing agencies for the maintenance of order and the security of life and property in Ireland. With that object they intend to see whether it is not possible to organize those existing agencies in a manner more efficient than that which at present exists. With that object I understand that they intend to appoint a Gentleman to the supreme civil and military control in certain districts which happen at this moment to be more disturbed than the rest of the country. They intend to place in his hands the responsible duty of at once re-organizing the agencies which they have at their disposal, and to make him responsible for the efficient exercise of the power of the law, and of all those powerful agencies. Sir, they have also announced that, if they find these measures insufficient for the maintenance of public order, they will not scruple to come to Parliament at the first moment and ask Parliament to give them such additional powers as they may think necessary. In addition, they have announced their intention of causing inquiry to be instituted into certain classes of subjects which, in their opinion, and in the opinion of many of us on this side of the House, are more closely connected with the root of the Irish difficulty than even the desire for greater self-government, or national independence, to the existence of which the Irish difficulty is attributed by the majority of those who sit on these Benches. Now, Sir, I am not aware that any of those measures which the Government propose at once to take are going to be challenged from any quarter of the House. I do not know whether the Amendments which may be moved by hon. Gentlemen who represent Irish constituencies will challenge any of those measures. So far as I have gathered from the speeches delivered in this part of the House, it is not the intention of any of my hon. Friends who sit on this Bench themselves to take exception to any of the actual measures proposed by the Government. But, although they are not directly challenged, they have been ridiculed and disparaged by the criticisms which have been made upon them. Sir, they have been ridiculed and they have been disparaged by Irish Members, and especially by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). They have been very fairly disparaged by that hon. Member from his point of view; because I conceive it is perfectly natural for him, and for those who agree with him in his opinion and in his object, not to desire the restoration—the complete restoration—of social order in Ireland until—[*Interruption by the Home Rule Members, and cries of* "Oh!" "Shame!" *and* "Withdraw!"] Before I am asked to withdraw, perhaps hon. Members will allow me to conclude the sentence. I say it is not unnatural to suppose that those hon. Gentlemen do not desire to see the complete restoration of social order in Ireland until those political objects have been accomplished upon which their hearts are set, and upon which they think the future and permanent prosperity and happiness of Ireland depend, and in favour of which the existing state of social order has undoubtedly, up to the present time, constituted one of the chief arguments which have been used by hon. Members sitting on this side of the House. We cannot expect that the hon. Member, and those who agree with him, should desire that rents—even fair rents—should be punctually and peacefully paid, because the hon. Member and his Friends have never accepted the Land Act of 1881, or the Amending Acts which followed, as a complete or final, or even as a satisfactory solution of the Irish Land Question; and we cannot expect them to desire that even fair rents should be peacefully and punctually paid until changes have been made which will have the effect and result of placing Irish occupiers in possession of their holdings on terms very different from those which were contemplated by the Acts of 1881 and of succeeding years, or even the terms contemplated and proposed by the Land Purchase Bill of the present year, introduced by the late Government. That, I say, is perfectly natural, and I do not see why anyone should complain that the measures of the Government should be disparaged by the hon. Member and those who agree with him. But they have also been ridiculed and disparaged by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby; and I think the House will require some further explanation than it has yet received of the grounds upon which my right hon. Friend has covered those measures with so much contempt and ridicule. My right hon. Friend, within a very short period, has occupied the position of Secretary of State, in which he was, perhaps, more than most of his Colleagues, responsible for social order in Ireland, as well as in the United Kingdom. My right hon. Friend was also one of the authors of the Land Act of 1881, and he was also one of the authors of the Land Purchase Bill of 1886; and I do not think my right hon. Friend has, as yet, quite given an adequate explanation of the contempt which he poured upon the measures proposed to be taken by Her Majesty's Government. Sir, I am tempted to ask what was the object of the speech of my right hon. Friend? If it was intended to be an assertion of his continued adherence to the principles of Home Rule for Ireland, which were embodied in the measures of the late Government, it seems to me that it was scarcely necessary. My right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition had already spoken, and he had admitted the substantial accuracy of the paragraph in Her Majesty's Speech as to the verdict of the country upon the subject. He had, on the same occasion, expressed in the clearest and in the strongest, but at the same time in the most moderate terms, his continued adherence to the principle of the measures which he proposed. Well, Sir, none of us doubted that my right hon. Friend spoke not only for himself, but for his Colleagues in the late Government; and it was quite unnecessary, in my opinion, for my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby to have added his assertion of continued adherence to the same principles. My right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition, on the same occasion, stated that, in his opinion, the main responsibility for the conduct of Irish policy must rest at the present time chiefly upon Her Majesty's present Government. Well, Sir, if my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby agrees in that statement, I am sure he would not willingly say or do anything that would add to the difficulties of Her Majesty's Government in that arduous and responsible task. But, Sir, was there not anything in my right hon. Friend's speech which was calculated to add to those great difficulties—those difficulties which not only have to be confronted by Her Majesty's Government, but which have had to be confronted by so many previous Governments. I cannot help thinking that there was something which was calculated to add to those difficulties, and which I cannot help regretting that my right hon. Friend should have said. He knows that the policy to which my right hon. Friend the late Leader of this House still adheres, and which he would recommend to the House, cannot be accepted by Her Majesty's present Government, and, even if it were proposed by Her Majesty's present Government, could not be accepted by a majority of the House. Whatever opinion my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby may hold as to the probable and future decision of the constituencies of the Kingdom, he must know—as was acknowledged by the Leader of the Opposition—that the verdict of the constituencies, so far as the present Parliament, at all events, is concerned, is final. He must know that the policy which he recommends—and which he honestly recommends—is one which cannot be adopted by the present House. But, Sir, does that fact in the slightest degree absolve the present Government from the duty which is incumbent on every Government, of maintaining, by every means in their power, social order and the supremacy of the law in Ireland? My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby attacked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the statement which he made, that the Government intended to treat the question of social order in Ireland entirely by itself. Now, I did not understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have made that statement as a general one applicable to all circumstances and to all conditions. I understood him to say that it was a proposition applicable to the present state of affairs in Ireland. Well, Sir, does my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby controvert the propriety of that statement in regard to the present circumstances and present conditions which prevail in Ireland? If my right hon. Friend intends to assert the contrary of that proposition, and to say that the question of social order can never, in any circumstances, be treated by itself, I confess that I feel bound to dissent from him. Social disorder in a country is an expression which means crime in that country; and my right hon. Friend cannot intend to assert that it is never, and can never be, the duty of a Government to repress the crime which exists in a country, unless it is prepared, at the same time, to discover, and when discovered to remove, the causes of that social disorder or that crime. The question whether it is possible to remove the causes which militate against social order in a country must depend upon the practicability of their removal. Social disorder may be caused—probably it is caused in Ireland—by political discontent; but it cannot be denied that political discontent may be well founded, or it may be ill founded. I do not quarrel with my right hon. Friend if he says that it is our duty to inquire whether that political discontent is well or ill founded. But whether it can be removed or not must depend on the answer which can be given to the question whether that discontent is well or ill founded; and I cannot assent to the proposition that it is not the duty of the Government to repress the crime which proceeds from that discontent until it has satisfied itself that the political discontent can be removed. My right hon. Friend has, I believe, held the same opinion himself. My right hon. Friend introduced, and conducted ably through this House, the Bill for the Prevention of Crime in Ireland. Perhaps the House will permit me to read a short extract from a speech delivered by my right hon. Friend in 1882 in reference to Ireland. My right hon. Friend said—

> "Though the body of Ireland is sound, there is a fearful plague spot upon it. . . . There is, Sir, a cancerous sore in Ireland. . . . It is the sore which springs from the baneful venom of secret societies and unlawful combinations. To that foul disease it is necessary that the surgeon's knife should be applied. We have to

cauterize and to extirpate it. . . . This poison that courses through the veins of the Irish social system is revealed in its effects. It breaks out into deeds which are alien altogether to the nature and genius of the Irish people—a people generous, warm-hearted, impulsive; excitable, perhaps, but who are not barbarous, nor cruel, nor savage in their nature. If that be so, what is the history of these midnight outrages and these daylight assassinations, these murders of undefended women and noble men? That is not the work of the mass of the Irish nation. They shrink from such deeds with horror and dismay, aye, and, what is still worse, with terror. These felon and miscreant deeds are the work of secret gangs of nocturnal conspiracies, of hired assassins."—(3 *Hansard*, [269] 463-4.)

Well, Sir, at that time my right hon. Friend knew very well what was the cause of social disorder in Ireland. He did not think it necessary to make any inquiries into the cause of that social disorder, or to give any further consideration to the matter at all; but he put his finger upon the cause, and said that the cause of this social disorder prevailing in Ireland was to be found in the existence of secret societies in that country. He did not go any further, and feel it necessary to inquire at that time what was the cause that produced the secret societies. He did not think it necessary to unite the question of social disorder with the causes from which it sprang. It was enough for him to know that in Ireland there existed secret societies, and it was enough for him to ask at the time that the House of Commons should apply the surgeon's knife and cut out the gangrene. My right hon. Friend did not explain why, in his judgment, the measure of applying the surgeon's knife was sufficient to deal with any question of social disorder in Ireland. If that were the case then, what has occurred since to make it impossible for him to rely—not upon the application of the surgeon's knife—but upon the milder application of the ordinary law, unless the House consents to investigate, as he now requires it to do, what are the further and ultimate causes of Irish discontent, Irish disaffection, and Irish disorder. The right hon. Gentleman referred also to the question of the land. To my right hon. Friend that question appears now to be one perfectly easy and simple. My right hon. Friend says that all the facts necessary for our consideration are well known. He says that we have the fact of the depreciation of the prices of agricultural produce, and we have the fact that large remissions of rent have been made by many English landlords, and we have the additional fact that Sir James Caird has written a letter to *The Times*, which he subsequently partially retracted, and that a few months ago *The Times* published a leading article in the same sense as the letter. To my right hon. Friend these facts appear to convey sufficient knowledge to the House in order to enable them to deal at once, completely, and satisfactorily with the Irish Land Question, and that, therefore, no further inquiry into the subject is needed. But the right hon. Gentleman did not state what he thought was the inference that ought to be drawn from these facts. This state of facts substantially existed four months ago, when the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was a Member introduced the Land Purchase Bill for Ireland. It existed at the time the late Elections were going on; and yet my right hon. Friend in April last, in his speech on the Land Purchase Bill, seems to have drawn altogether a different inference from those facts from that which he draws now. During the period when that Bill was being introduced and during the period of the Election we never heard from either the right hon. Gentleman, or from his Colleagues in Office, anything about these undisputed facts, or the legislation that would be necessary in order to apply these facts to the condition of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman attacks the declaration made by the Prime Minister in "another place," as to the duty incumbent on the State, in the event of unfair rents having been fixed by the Land Commission, to make up to the landlords the difference between the fair value of the holding and the amount of the rent. Well, Sir, I am not going to discuss that question. It appears to me that it would involve an unprofitable expenditure of time to discuss propositions of that kind, which cannot possibly be profitably discussed until they are embodied in the provisions of a Bill of some kind. But if that were not so, why did the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues propose, practically, to adopt that principle in the measure which they presented to the House in April of the present year? [*Cries of* "No!"] Why, the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues themselves proposed to purchase out the Irish landlords upon the basis of 20 years' purchase of the judicial rents—[*Cries of* "No!"]—with certain reductions, I admit, in certain cases, but upon that general basis. [Mr. BIGGAR: No; not upon that general basis.] If any hon. Member who doubts the accuracy of my statement will read the speech of the Leader of the Opposition on the occasion of the introduction of the Land Purchase Bill, he will see that that measure was based upon the general principle of 20 years' purchase—[Mr. BIGGAR: No!]—and will anyone tell me, therefore, that if it was the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman at that time, that there are 538,000 holdings in Ireland—to adopt the dictum of Sir James Caird—that there are 538,000 holdings in Ireland which are incapable of paying any economic rent at all, that the late Government intended nothing when they proposed to give 20 years' purchase of the judicial rents?—[*Cries of* "No!"]—and that when they made that proposal they did it with the knowledge that in 500,000 holdings in Ireland reductions would have to be made upon the judicial rents which would reduce the purchase money to nothing at all? My right hon. Friend said that I and my Friends denounced the Land Purchase Act which was introduced by the late Government. As a matter of fact, I said very little indeed about the Land Purchase Act; but what I have said, upon more than one occasion, was that in my judgment, if the Government of Ireland Bill were passed, some Act founded upon similar principles to those contained in the Land Purchase Bill was a measure called for both in equity and in justice. What I pointed out, and what was pointed out still more strongly by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) was that the Land Purchase Bill did propose a very large expenditure and imposed a very large liability upon the British taxpayer, and that this was to be done upon the strength of what seemed to us to be extremely bad security. That, however, is a question upon which I need not enter at length on the present occasion; but when I am told that I have denounced, or have repudiated, the principle upon which the Land Purchase Bill was framed, I altogether contradict the assertion. I never concealed the fact that I agreed with the late Prime Minister, and with the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, as to the propriety of such a Bill as the necessary complement of the Government of Ireland Bill. Sir, I do not think that anyone now dissents from the proposition that any modification of it ought to proceed in the direction of an attempt to increase the efficiency of the Land Purchase Clauses of that Act. If it is generally admitted, as I think it is, that the principle of dual ownership upon which that Act is based has not been successful, if it is admitted that the Act of 1881 cannot be considered a final settlement of the Land Question—if it be admitted that any amendment of that Act ought, if possible, to be directed to the substitution of single ownership for the dual ownership established by the Act—if all that be admitted, it seems to me that it would be extremely desirable, before the House proceeds to make another attempt in the direction of a settlement of the Irish Land Question, that it should be on the basis of the fullest, the most complete, and the most accurate information that can be obtained, both as to the deficiencies and the advantages of the Acts we have hitherto passed, and as to any change in the general agrarian condition of Ireland which may have supervened from other causes. Therefore, I cannot see that there is anything that has been said, either by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham or by myself, or by any hon. Member on this side of the House, which has implied that we should necessarily be predisposed to treat with ridicule any *bonâ fide* and sincere attempt to investigate the real condition of the agrarian question in Ireland, or the causes which have prevented the attempt of 1881 from becoming, as we hoped it would, at all events, a final settlement of the question. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) said that an agrarian crisis will be upon us next November, and it would be useless to discover that judicial rents are too high when thousands of tenants would be cast out of their holdings. [Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: Through your assistance.] But, Sir, if that is the case, the measures which were proposed by the late Government would have afforded no remedy. The Land Purchase Bill of the late Government would not have come into operation until the appointed day, which certainly was not before the 1st of November next. It could not have had a very sudden or a very rapid operation; and hon. Members from Ireland, and hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, do not seem to have discovered the imminence of this agrarian crisis which is upon us. Representatives from Ireland appear to have been perfectly ready to acquiesce in this agrarian crisis coming upon us next November and the eviction of those hundreds and thousands of tenants—[*Cries of* "No!"]—in consideration of the political benefits proposed by the Irish Government Bill of the late Government to be conferred upon them. Sir, it has been said that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer has given advice to the Irish landlords to exercise their rights with relentless severity, and to exact their rents to the uttermost farthing. I cannot say that I heard in the speech any expression that would bear that interpretation. I was glad to hear, in the earlier part of this evening, the Chief Secretary for Ireland absolutely repudiate any such interpretation of any words which fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not think that any such interpretation was any more fair to the Chancellor of the Exchequer than it would be fair to say that certain expressions which fell from my right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition as to the probability, under existing circumstances, that judicial rents were in some cases too high to be paid by the tenants was a general invitation to refuse the payment of rent. Sir, I do not think that we ought, in circumstances such as those in which we are placed, to go out of our way to endeavour to force interpretations upon the words of public men of one side or the other of the House which they are not intended to bear, and which it would be most injurious to the public interest that they should be strained to bear. It is obviously in the interests of all classes connected with land in Ireland—it is in the interest of the public; it is in the interest of the State—that at such a time as this, which is undoubtedly a time of pressure and hardship upon all classes in England, Scotland, or Ireland who are connected with land, that the rights of landlords—even if those rights have been recently ascertained, and, to a certain extent, guaranteed under State interference—should be exercised with forbearance and moderation. Sir, I do not believe Her Majesty's present Government intend to offer one word in a different spirit to the advice given by the late Conservative Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—that the landlords of Ireland should exercise their rights with prudence and moderation. Certainly, it is not for the public interest that they should do otherwise; but, certainly, it is equally to the disadvantage of the public interest that any encouragement should be given to the idea that Her Majesty's Executive Government will or can refuse to make use of the powers of the law which are entrusted to them for the purpose of enforcing the legal rights of those who have the right to exercise them. Her Majesty's Government are aware, and this House is aware, that this is not a matter which is entirely within the discretion of Her Majesty's Government. Individuals of all classes, whether they be landlords or whether they be others, have their rights, and have a right to appeal to law; and it is not in the power of this Government, or of any Government, to raise itself as a dispensing power superior to the law when the rights of others are imperilled. And no greater disservice could be done to the tenants of Ireland, or to the cause of social order in that country, than to induce any class of Irishmen to believe that there exists in the hands of any Government such a dispensing power to override the legal rights of any class of Her Majesty's subjects. Sir, this view was held by Her Majesty's late Government. A speech was made in this House by my right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley), in which he was supposed for the time to have claimed for the Irish Government such a dispensing power; but that interpretation of the speech was denied both in this House, and by Lord Spencer in the Upper House, and the Government, as it was its duty, and as it had no alternative in doing, altogether disclaimed any intention of setting itself up as a power superior to the ordinary law. Now, Sir, perhaps I may be allowed to allude, very briefly indeed, to another question which was referred to in the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the question of public works in Ireland. That has been denounced by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool and by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby as a proposal, in a disguised form, to confer demoralizing alms upon the people of Ireland. I agree with my right hon. Friend that anything in the nature of disguised alms would be most injurious to the people of Ireland themselves, and that nothing could be more injurious to the people of Great Britain, at whose expense they would be given; but the question is whether it is possible to undertake an expenditure of public money in Ireland which shall not be in the nature of disguised alms to the Irish people. There can, I think, be very little doubt that an inquiry of the character proposed to be undertaken by the Government would be one of the first undertakings which an Irish National Government would be likely to take in hand; and it does not seem to me unreasonable that we, having refused to establish an Irish National Government, should endeavour to do that which, in our opinion, is reasonable, and what an Irish Government would be likely to do for itself. It appears to me that it is a subject worth inquiring into, whether there are not in Ireland certain classes of public works which cannot, in the present state of Ireland at all events, be undertaken by private enterprize, but which may, with a reasonable prospect of success, be undertaken by the Government. We all know very well, unfortunately, that the state of Ireland is such at the present time—and it is not likely for some time to be otherwise—as not to induce private capital to be expended upon works of this description. We know also that there are certain classes of public works in Ireland, such as arterial drainage, which could hardly, under any circumstances, be undertaken by private enterprize, because, in order to enable such works to be undertaken, large legislative powers would have to be conferred on a Company that Parliament would be very unlikely to confer upon a private body. Well, Sir, I do not know whether the Government look forward with great hope to this proposal; but, at all events, it appears to me that, however much information may have resulted from previous inquiries, and may have been collected on many subjects, there is not in the possession of this House, or of the Government, that practical information of the nature that is proposed to be obtained by the Government which would enable the Government to propose to Parliament to adopt any considerable expenditure of the public money in Ireland. I do not think, certainly, that we are in possession of information which would warrant any such expenditure of public money now. But, on the other hand, I maintain that we are not in possession of such complete information on the subject as would justify us in saying that under no circumstances should public money be so granted. I will not detain the House on the question of local government in Ireland at any length. I do not believe there is any Party in this House who will seriously object to the intention of the Government to postpone the consideration of that subject until next February. I have already said that it is impossible for the present Government, or for the present Parliament, to deal with the question of local government as my right hon. and hon. Friends on this side of the House think it ought to be dealt with. If an attempt is to be made to deal with it on different lines, and on a different basis, surely, Sir, it is desirable that some interval, some time for reflection, some time for those passions to calm down which have been excited should be afforded; and certainly, if we are to approach this question of local government for Ireland, and also for the whole of the United Kingdom, it is desirable in the interests, not of Ireland alone, but of the whole of the United Kingdom, that we should approach it in that temper which can only be produced by some delay, and some period for reflection. In conclusion, I can only say I trust that a fair and a candid consideration and trial will be given to the policy which has been thus fully explained by Her Majesty's Government. My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby has complained, or has said—for I do not know whether he complained—that the policy of the late Government was condemned without a trial. Surely my right hon. Friend must know that the decision of the House on such proposals as those which were laid before us by the late Government must necessarily be made without a trial. The measure, whether it were good or whether it were bad, was one which, in its nature, was an irrevocable step, from which there was no return. We were bound and obliged to form our opinion on the merits or demerits of that policy as they were laid before us by the Government, and from the circumstances and the nature of the case it was impossible that anything in the nature of an experimental trial should be afforded. But, Sir, that is no reason why a trial should not be given to the policy which is now explained by Her Majesty's Government. If it is less extensive, less ambitious, less far-reaching, less heroic in its aims than the policy which was rejected by the late Parliament, at all events it cannot be denied that it does not present those dangers and those risks from which we recoil, and from which the country has recoiled. Sir, if the policy of the late Government was, as my right hon. Friends think, founded on justice and on reason, that policy must ultimately prevail. Their case will not be prejudiced, but it will rather be strengthened, by a fair and an honest attempt, on the part of all Parties in this House, to give a fair, an honest, and a candid consideration to a policy which is intended, at all events, to give to Ireland a period of rest and of repose, and to afford an opportunity for the institution of sound and practicable reforms in that country, which has for so many years distracted the deliberations of this House and perplexed the statesmanship of this country.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to find myself able to echo most cordially the sentiments with which my noble Friend has just concluded his very forcible speech. I have never been one of those who have denied to Dissentient Liberals the perfect right and freedom of discussing the measure which my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) proposed almost as unsparingly and as impartially as if the criticism had come from Ministers of the opposite Party. Again, when my noble Friend said that he had never used any language other than the language of respect towards my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, as far as I know he is amply justified in that statement he made. My noble Friend himself, and many of those who acted with him in what I well know they must have found to be a painful and an embarrassing position, have behaved as we should have expected from English citizens of their position and character. So much, however, cannot be said by all those who have taken part in the controversy. But, Sir, when we look to the future, I confess that I hear very little in the language and observations, and see very little in the attitude, of my noble Friend which encourages the hope that those embarrassments and divisions which have so distressed and perplexed the country are likely soon to come to an end. I feel, Sir, that we must all of us accept the position. Whether those who do not agree with us have or have not forfeited their claim to Liberalism, I, for one, will not now attempt to decide. All that we now say is that a new emergency, and a great emergency, has arisen, and that we think we are applying to that emergency the old principles of our Party. We not only think, but we know, that we have with us the great majority of the Liberal voters. We must wait and see whether circumstances will not justify us in our view of the Irish crisis, and we shall certainly spare no efforts in our endeavour to convert the constituencies to our way of thinking. Sir, my noble Friend has said, as the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary said at an earlier part of the evening, that it was unreasonable to take up a position which implied that Her Majesty's Government are not bound, whatever may be the ultimate solution of the Irish Constitutional difficulty, to do their best to preserve law and order in the meantime. That is a proposition which none of us, I think, on this side of the House shall for a moment deny. But I cannot help remembering that very much the same body of Gentlemen as those who now discharge the duties of Her Majesty's Government were in power not so many months ago, and it was their duty then, as it is now, to preserve order and to put down disturbance. Well, did they do so? Why, we had a debate in this House on the 4th of March last, in which the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) gave a rather pathetic account of the attempts of that Government, in the autumn of 1885, to keep law and order. What were the words of the right hon. and learned Gentleman? He said—

> "That during the last months of 1885 he applied himself to the task of the administration of justice with whatever abilities he possessed, and certainly with unremitting attention. The Criminal Law was put in force on every possible occasion; every effort was made to maintain the reign of law and order; but, nevertheless, the social condition of the country did not improve."—(3 *Hansard*, [302] 1921-2.)

I ask on what grounds right hon. Gentlemen opposite can expect now to be able to perform that duty, on which they laid so much stress, when they have no more means of preserving order than they had in the last months of 1885? I cannot see why, exactly, as they failed in the concluding months of 1885, they will not be found to have failed in the concluding months of 1886. Sir, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the figures of crime which he quoted the other day, in reply to my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), did not quite see my right hon. Friend's point. Our point is this—Why is it that you, who insisted, on the 26th of January, 1886, that there was a state of things which justified coercion now, when the state of things is very much the same as it was then, no longer believe in the policy and the remedies which you then thought urgent? You are in this dilemma. You either made a mistake on the 26th of January, when you asked for coercion, or you are making a mistake now. In either case it is difficult to avoid a suspicion of political levity and insincerity. The noble Lord and the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland have told us that there are two centres of disturbance and disorder in Ireland; and they propose to deal with both one and the other—both with the North and South. So far as the North is concerned, and the riots in Belfast, we shall, I believe, have an early opportunity of discussing the question very fully, before the debate closes, on a special Amendment relating to those disturbances. I will only point out one very remarkable statement, illustrating the spirit in which the late Government was judged by the hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. Johnston), when he said, although his own Leaders have warned him of the fatal effect of disparaging the Royal Constabulary, that there had been a conspiracy—I took his words down at the time—to degrade the town of Belfast. He said that Catholic Constabulary had gone down to Belfast with the special intention of massacreing their Protestant fellow-subjects. [MR. JOHNSTON: Hear, hear!] Some hon. Member on the other side of the House has the courage of his opinions, and says "Hear, hear!" [*Cries of* "Johnston—Ballykilbeg!"] I am not going to dwell upon that point. I will only make this one remark—I merely ask the hon. Member to realize what it is that he implies when he says that. He means that the late Lord Lieutenant, Lord Aberdeen, who is a Protestant, and I, who am not exactly a domineering Catholic, instructed the Under Secretary, who is a Protestant, to direct the Inspector General, who is a Protestant, to collect a force of Catholic Constabulary to massacre Protestants in the streets of Belfast. That is the position of the hon. Member for South Belfast. Perhaps we shall hear more of it by-and-bye. There is another point in connection with the Belfast riots to which I will call attention. The Chief Secretary told us on the first night of the Session that there will be an extension of the scope of the inquiry of the Commission on the outrages in Belfast. As a matter of fact, in answer to my Question today, he told us what the extension would be. There is no extension whatever of the terms of the Commission, but only an alleged change of interpretation, which is no change at all, because it is the interpretation which we intended at the time.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Its scope will also be indicated by the legal and Parliamentary powers it is proposed to confer upon the Commissioners.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Quite true, as the Government are going to bring in another Bill, of which I entirely approve. But that does not alter the scope of the inquiry. It is alleged that we had excluded the police from the scope of the inquiry. That is an entire misapprehension. Every possible circumstance in connection with the riots was taken into our purview, and stated in the Lord Lieutenant's Warrant. Therefore, there ought to be no misapprehension. Sir, as to the state of the counties of Kerry and Clare and the districts of

Limerick and Galway, I am amused that the noble Lord and the Party opposite and their Friends on this side should think it possible to divorce the consideration of restoring social order from such matters as the Land Question. The noble Lord himself said that outrages of a certain form were most common in the county of Kerry, and he also told us that in Kerry there are two landlords for whose protection a force of no less than 70 Constabulary is employed. Does a fact like that show that there is no connection between social disturbance and the Land Question? The noble Lord gave us the figures of crime in the disturbed counties, and he said, truly enough, that agrarian crime is chiefly prevalent in Connaught and Munster. I will take the liberty of supplementing the noble Lord's figures of crime with the figures of eviction. I want to illustrate the extraordinary fallacy of supposing that you can consider the question of the restoration of social order without considering the existence of the agrarian question. In 1885 the outrages in Ulster and Leinster were 216; and in Connaught and Munster they were 790. The evictions of families in Ulster and Leinster were 1,268, and in Connaught and Munster 1,859. That is to say, where you have most evictions there you have most outrages. In the first six months of the present year, in Ulster and Leinster 703 families were evicted, and in Connaught and Munster 1,304. The outrages in Ulster and Leinster were 103, and in Connaught and Munster they were 450. The House will not suppose that I am for one moment saying that evictions are an excuse for outrages; but I say that they are an explanation of outrages, and that they prove that the root of social disorder is somehow or other to be found in the agrarian question. This is not a mere abstract consideration; it has a very close and direct bearing upon the policy which Her Majesty's Government have foreshadowed; because they are going to take measures—of which I will say a word presently—to stop outrage, on the one hand, and to encourage evictions on the other. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) has found fault with my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) for fastening that signification upon the language and proposals of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I defy anybody to read the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer now, and not to recognize that in every line of it there is an assurance to the landlords that they will have the uttermost farthing wrung for them from the tenants. [*Cries of* "No!"] I say "Yes!" and that an assurance of that kind coming from so important a Minister is, in effect, as my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby said, an invitation and an incitement to the landlords to proceed to evictions. While you are sending a General to put down midnight crime you are providing work for your General to do. While you are attempting—and I admit sincerely attempting—to dam the stream of agrarian crime, you are replenishing the tributaries from which that stream is fed. So far as the special measures are concerned which the Government have promised to take in the case of Kerry I do not like to say anything. The demoralization in Kerry is so great that anybody, who is responsible for even a decent semblance of order in that county, may be excused for resorting to almost any expedient in order to get at the root of the mischief. But, after six months' study of the condition of things in Kerry, Galway, Limerick, and Clare, it seems to me very doubtful indeed whether very much good can come from sending there a person of the eminent position and high character of General Buller. I am not at all certain that that is the kind of thing that you want. I am not at all sure that he will be able to perform, or to stimulate the performance, of those duties connected with the detection of crime which are likely to bring about a better state of things in Kerry. What is the real evil? It is an evil that no General can touch. It is that the public opinion of the country, and all the district, is against the restoration of law and order, and in favour of the concealment of these midnight marauders and criminals from the officers of justice. What is your General to do in the presence of facts such as occurred in my period of office, and are doubtless occurring now—where a man who has been shot refuses to identify those who have shot him, although the police knew perfectly well that he knew who shot him and could identify them? In other cases, men who have been attacked and who, in the exasperation of the moment, have consented to identify their assailants, have remained silent when the time has come for them to give evidence in Court, and have refused to identify anyone. How do you hope to be able, by sending down General Buller to the disturbed districts, to restore law and order, or bring about a better state of things in a country where public opinion is so corrupted and perverted? The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) told you what was the right remedy. We believed him. He said, and we believed, that he and his Friends detested the crimes perpetrated in Kerry quite as much as any other hon. Members in this House. [" Oh, oh!"] It will not, I am sure, be denied by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, if he is present, that the National League has done its very best—and that it has been unsuccessful shows how very deep down the demoralization lies — it will not be denied that the National League has done its best to put down disorder and disturbance in Kerry. [*Renewed cries of* "Oh!"] Hon. Members opposite know more about it than I do, and more, no doubt, than the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary does. But I will warrant that if the Chief Secretary were here he would not contradict what I am now saying. I return to my point, which is that the hon. Member for Cork was right when he used these words in his memorable speech on the Government of Ireland Bill—

> "Try the effect of self-government; and if Kerry men then resort to outrages, they will very soon find that the rest of Ireland will put a stop to them."—(3 *Hansard*, [306] 1170.)

The noble Marquess who has just sat down indulged in a good deal of satire at the expense of my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, on the ground that he had been a party to bring in the Crimes Act of 1882, and had advanced certain propositions in support of that Act which do not exactly square with the position taken up by my right hon. Friend to-day. But why do you not bring in a Crimes Act yourselves? If my right hon. Friend is inconsistent in not using the same language to-day as he thought fit to use when he introduced the Crimes Act in 1882, how are you less inconsistent when, on January the 26th, you declared that it was necessary and indispensable that the National League should be suppressed, and that exceptional legislation should be introduced — how are you less inconsistent in not introducing such legislation now? My right hon. Friend is not inconsistent because in 1882 he alluded to the surgeon's knife. The surgeon's knife has been applied to Ireland and it has failed. Well, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said that there is a great difference now, and that Her Majesty's Government are not inconsistent in not asking for repressive legislation, in spite of the existence of a similar state of things in Ireland now as existed in January last when they did ask for it, because the situation has been altered by the action of my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, who, he says, is now the Leader of the Nationalist Party. [*Ministerial cheers.*] What, you cheer that now, although two or three hours ago you cheered the statement of the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland when he said that my right hon. Friend had made the position a great deal more difficult than it was previously! Now, Sir, I wish hon. Gentlemen opposite would make up their minds as to whether our action and our proposed legislation have made the position of the Government in respect of keeping law and order easier or more difficult? The noble Lord said that we had made it easier. [*Cries of* "No!"] The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant said that we had made it more difficult. [*Cries of* "No!"] Sir, I myself agree with the noble Lord. I admit the first and primary task of the Government to be that of doing what they can to preserve law and order; but I firmly believe that our legislative proposals have made your task far easier, because you have now, at all events, this conviction in the mind of the Irish population which gives them a measure of patience such as I believe they have never had before —the conviction that though our proposals have for a time been rejected, yet that these proposals have been and are still, not in the letter, but in the spirit and in principle, supported by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, by those who were his Colleagues, and by an enormous mass of the voters of Great Britain. It is that conviction, and the patience which springs from it, that will, I hope and believe, make your task much easier, if you have the courage to face it. But I must confess, Sir, that I am disappointed —I hope only for a time—in the narrowness of the proposals which Her Majesty's Government have foreshadowed, and which the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale, to our still greater surprise, for reasons that I shall have to refer to presently, finds completely adequate and satisfactory. The proposal for the issue of these Commissions is, on the whole, a process with which it is very difficult to find fault. [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN : Hear, hear!] I quite agree with my right hon. Friend who cheers that, that it is the business of Parliaments and Governments to supply themselves with all the information that it is possible to obtain before they proceed to legislation. But I will point out one great difference between the Commission to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred as the precedent for the Commission which the Government are about to issue. The noble Lord said—"You quarrel with us for proposing to issue a Land Commission. Why, in 1880, you yourselves issued a Land Commission." That was the Bessborough Commission. Well, Sir, that is quite true; but there is all the difference between the Commission of 1880 and the Land Commission of Her Majesty's Government. The Bessborough Commission of 1880 was issued as preliminary to a Bill, which the Government announced their intention of bringing forward. But your Land Commission is one to inquire whether there is to be a Bill; whether it is proper and expedient to bring forward a Bill or not. It is plain that there is all the difference in the world between the issue of that Commission and such a Commission as this. Then, again, Sir, I should like to point out, in the second place, that this issuing of your Land Commission, from the terms in which you announce it, is calculated to have a very remarkable and a very mischievous effect upon social order in Ireland in October and November next; and I will tell the House why. The Commission is to inquire whether or not there has been such a fall in the price of produce as to justify and warrant the proposition that rents are too high. But what will be the effect of an announcement of that kind? What does it put at once into the minds both of the landlords and the tenants? Why, Sir, this. The landlord will know that it is to his interest to extort the uttermost farthing from his tenants, in order to prove that rents are not too high and need no re-adjustment; while the tenants, on the other hand, have an equal interest, from the same standpoint of impressing the minds of the Commissioners, in not paying their rent, in order that this Commission of Inquiry may be led to conclude that rents are too high and do urgently require revision. If hon. Members on either side consider the effect of that, they will perceive that the influence upon social order in the months of October and November must be most mischievous. I should like to put another question in reference to the Land Commission. One of the branches of Reference is as to whether there is such secret terrorism as to paralyze industry and discourage capital; and I want to know who is going to tell the Commissioners whether there is this terrorism which paralyzes industry or not? Where are the Commissioners going to get any new information worth having on this most important question?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing), interrupting, was understood to demur to the terms of the Reference as quoted by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Surely that is one of the points referred to.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): The Commission is to inquire whether there is any intimidation. That is one of the points of the Reference.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: The noble Lord's words were—"In what part of Ireland combinations to resist the force of legal obligations affect the Land Act of 1881." Undoubtedly, these "combinations" we all understand to mean the operations of the National League; and those operations are supposed to involve terrorism. But, Sir, who is going to tell the Commission anything on this subject? The landlord's story we know. We need no inquiry for that. Then, are the victims and the dupes of this terrorism going before the Commission in Dublin, Tralee, or Limerick, or wherever the place may be, to give evidence to the effect that they are terrorized and their industry paralyzed, and that they would pay their rents if they dared? If so, they cannot be very violently terrorized, and the combination cannot be a very formidable one. Who, besides the landlords and the terrorized tenants, are to give information? Are the police and the Resident Magistrates to give evidence? Why, you have every mouth full and authentic reports from the Resident and District Magistrates, and you know exactly from the best authorities the effect these combinations have on the relations of landlord and tenant. Therefore, Sir, one of the most important points of your Reference will be absolutely inoperative. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, and the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night repeated the argument, that one of the points on which you were most anxious for information was how best to deal with the surplus population and the other evils of the congested districts. Why, you know very well that there are very few Members of this House, who have taken any interest whatever in Irish affairs, who are not perfectly well acquainted with the condition and temper of the population of the congested districts, and I do not believe there is one of them who will deny this assertion—that it would be more than the existence of any Government is worth, more than the peace of Ireland is worth, for any British Government, whether Liberal or Tory, to attempt to deal in a large way with the population of the congested districts in question, and in the only way that would be conducive to the amelioration of their condition, and that it is only a Native Irish Government at whose hands they will tolerate the bringing home to them of the only remedy that their situation is capable of. There are, on the Front Bench, at least three or four Members of the Government who are well acquainted with the condition of the population of the congested districts. I do not believe there is one of them who will get up and deny the truth of this assertion—that it would be more than the existence of any Government is worth, more than the peace of Ireland would be worth, for any British Government to attempt to deal in a large way with the population of the congested districts in the West of Ireland. You can only do it—it would only be tolerated and suffered to be done by a Government of their own choosing and of their own people. A great deal has been said about the Land Question; but it can be more usefully discussed in connection with an Amendment that is to be brought forward by the hon. Member for Cork to-morrow. That Amendment will put all the issues before the House, and afford an opportunity to hon. Members for going fully into the matter, I can only say that the language of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale in respect of the Land Question to-night is not perfectly in accord with the language of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because my noble Friend seems to anticipate that a new Land Act will have to be produced. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!"] Yes; but the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer certainly said pretty plainly that no revision of the Land Act of 1881 was in the minds of the Government at the present moment, and that, on the contrary, they regarded the Land Act of 1881 as containing in it the elements of finality. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale does not think so, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night, I am bound to say, in consequence possibly of representations that may have been made to him since the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, did take rather a new line, and implied that we are to look out for a new Land Bill. Now, Sir, I have always said that the settlement of the Land Question was an indispensable preliminary or accompaniment to any attempt to restore order in Ireland, and I think it will be found that you are going to have a Land Bill upon the lines that were shadowed forth—not mentioned in this House—but shadowed forth in "another place" by the Prime Minister. If you are going to have a Land Bill that is to fasten upon the taxpayers of this country the difference—the capitalized difference—between what the landlords of Ireland are now receiving and what they ought, on a fair market value, to be receiving, decidedly the country will wish that they had accepted our Land Bill rather than the Bill of the Government. I notice that the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale said nothing to-night on that subject. He said nothing upon the payment by the State of the difference between the true value of the rent and the value as fixed by the Land Commissioners. Sir, in reference to the immediate question of evictions I only want to make one remark. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale has echoed the spirit of the remarks of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the propriety and expediency and justice of enforcing legal obligations, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night pointed out that the Land Act of 1881 contains a clause by which all tenants under agreement—that is to say, all tenants whose rents have not been fixed by the Land Commissioners—may go before the Court and plead extenuating circumstances and get a stay of eviction. But, as my hon. Friend the junior Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) has said, how can you suppose that these miserable people in the West of Ireland—if they are paying an excessive rent, or cannot pay the rent demanded of them—how are they, in their squalor and helplessness, to appear before the Land Court and plead for a stay of eviction? I cannot imagine a more preposterous form of solace than that. Reference has been made to-night by the noble Marquess to a speech which I made in the early part of my official career, as to the necessity of some power being given to stay evictions. I then said that it was greatly to be regretted that there was not a power somewhere or other to discriminate between cases where tenants can pay and cases where tenants cannot pay. That remark was very unfavourably received in many quarters where I expected it would have met with favour. I have, since that remark was made, taken a great deal of trouble to see whether it has occurred to lawyers and judicial functionaries in Ireland to consider whether it was not possible that some such equity and some such discriminating power could be introduced. It is too late now; but I did find that there were judicial authorities of no inconsiderable eminence who believed that it might be possible and would be acceptable, if Parliament could be got to assent to it, for a tenant to go to those tribunals to which the landlord now goes for an ejectment—mostly the County Courts—and to plead conditions which would excuse him, for a time at least, from having the extreme process of eviction put in force against him. It would, of course, be rash for me or any other than a Minister of the Crown to father proposals of that kind; but I do hope that the Government will turn them over in their mind in the autumn which is to pass before Parliament reassembles and see whether something cannot be done in that direction. I should not be surprised if they were to encourage such a movement. At all events, I am sure that unless they do they will run great risks—I hope I shall not be interpreted as holding out any threat—and that within a certain number of months, unless something is done in that direction, there will undoubtedly be serious peril of great social disturbances. I hope my right hon. Friend near me, after what he has said on the subject, will use all the influence he possesses—which, considering the position he occupies, ought to be considerable—with right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, in promoting a policy of that kind. Now, Sir, I only want to say one word on the subject of the smaller Commission. That Commission, I am afraid, is a very small Commission for running up a very big bill. We know something upstairs of what engineers, contractors, and experts can do when they are consulted as to schemes, and when I think of Irish engineers, contractors, and experts being consulted by the Imperial Government as to what can be done in the way of the amelioration of the condition of Ireland by public works, I confess that the vision which opens itself to my mind is one of the most appalling that I can conceive. They will be very unworthy of their professional reputation if they do not prove to demonstration that many millions and scores of millions can be expended in Ireland to the greatest possible advantage. But what I am surprised at is, that at this time of day any serious or responsible Government can dream of instituting a Commission to deal with points and questions of this kind. Have they forgotten that only last year there was a Committee sitting upstairs on Irish Industries, the result of whose labours appeared in a Blue Book of 1,000 pages? Are they aware of the existence of all that evidence, and do they believe that a Commission sitting between this and the end of the year will be able to add one jot or tittle to the evidence already taken? I, for my part, entirely doubt it. I have read that Blue Book pretty carefully, and I say that I cannot imagine any scheme devised by the ingenuity of man which is not defended by witnesses examined before that Committee. They had before them some of the best experts who could be got together in railway management, in mining, in civil engineering, and in every branch which this small Commission is to include; and I say that the evidence on canals, mines, arterial drainage, railways, and fisheries is complete. I say that, after all the evidence collected in past years, there was only one Committee needed to consider the evidence, and that was the Committee of 14 or 15 Gentlemen who constitute Her Majesty's Government. They have ample materials on which to form their judgment in the evidence given; they must have been aware of this, and I cannot imagine that they suppose the evidence can in any way be invalidated, or that any further information or suggestions will be brought before the Commission which they have announced their intention of appointing. Now, Sir, with regard to the proposal to spend millions of our money upon public works in Ireland, I, myself, regard it as of more doubtful expediency, when it is performed by a British Government, and under the supervision of a British Parliament—I regard it as of more doubtful expediency than any proposal which I can imagine Her Majesty's Government could put forward. It is true, as has been stated to-night, that Irish Members below the Gangway have demanded the expenditure of money on public works in Ireland; and so long as they could not get these works taken in hand in any other way, I should not blame them. But these Gentlemen knew at the time they were calling for them that, however excellent they were in their purpose, they would be a hundred times better performed, and better adapted to the ends they were intended to accomplish, if they were taken in hand even with lessened resources, with a poorer Treasury, by an Irish Government and an Irish Parliament. It is just the difference between an estate managed by the Court of Chancery and an estate managed by the owner who is on the spot, and whose mind is constantly turning to the improvement of the estate. If our Bill had been passed, and if there had been an Irish Legislature to superintend and an Irish Executive to carry out many of those works which have been advocated in Ireland, and which Her Majesty's Government hold out some hope of having carried out, then I believe that enormous good would have been done to Ireland; and not only do I believe that, but I believe it would have been one of the first tasks taken in hand by an Irish Government? But, Sir, I protest, with all the force of which I am capable, against the British Government undertaking a vast expenditure of public funds upon works with regard to which Irish Members have not been consulted, which Irish Members will not supervise, and over which it is probable that the Irish Representatives will have no more control than they have had on the suggested issue of a Commission. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland said to-night that his Friends and he were in favour of a policy of decentralization. But these great works of yours—how will you decentralize the administration of these enormous works? They are works for which provision is to be made out of the Public Exchequer. You are not going to allow enormous sums from the Exchequer to be expended without supervision by the agents of the Exchequer. You now expend considerable sums in Ireland, but you do not give it to the Local Authorities; and I am sure you are not going to intrust the expenditure of these funds to the Local Authorities in Ireland without State supervision. Well, then, you must have State supervision, and the moment you have that you must have a State Institution, as you have now in the Board of Works. But, if you read the Blue Book I have already referred to, you will find that, although everybody has a scheme which he wishes the Government to undertake, yet everyone equally protests against the way in which the Board of Works does business, checks enterprize, and defeats the object in view. I am not for a moment saying that these charges against the Board of Works are just; but I say that the Board of Works are a centralizing body over which the Gentlemen from Ireland have no control. Clearly, if you are going to create a large spending Department in Ireland, you will have naturally to appoint over it a permanent Board of officials to supervize the expenditure;

and I say it is folly to talk of decentralization so long as in all that expenditure, and in all the details of these public works, the Representatives of Ireland will have no voice, will never be consulted, and will never be able to exercise any effective supervision. But you will say that this House will exercise supervision. Sir, I say that if the supervision of Parliament means supervision by this House of the Executive administration in Ireland, it is fatal to the efficiency of the Irish Executive, and fatal to the success of Irish administration. We know very well what supervision by this House of Irish government means; it means that the House takes the word of the Chief Secretary for Ireland for what is done, and that Irish Members may take what line they please, make what protests they please; but the majority of the House, being ignorant and ill-informed, will naturally suppose that the Chief Secretary for Ireland knows what is right better than they do. I contend that, although you are going to set up Local Authorities, you are about, by this great expenditure of public money, to feed and give new nourishment to the centralizing system, and new discouragement to the interests of Irishmen in the affairs of their country. One other announcement is that you are going to extend local government in Ireland upon the same principles as those which you intend to apply to the extension of local government in England and Scotland. We are to have equality, similarity, and simultaneity. As to simultaneity, I only ask whether Lord Salisbury was in favour of simultaneity when he said he would give Ireland local government after 20 years of coercion, and whether we, in England and Scotland, are also to wait 20 years for local government? So much for simultaneity. One word about equality and similarity. I wish to ask the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who favours this formula, two things. He says you are to have equality and similarity as between the powers of Local Authorities in Ireland and those in England and Scotland. Now, is the noble Lord going to give to the new Local Authorities in Ireland that control over the expenditure of local taxation, and over local valuation and assessment, which is possessed, and I hope will be possessed, by the Local Authorities in England and Scotland? One other point. When the noble Lord talks of equality and similarity, is he going to give to the Local Authorities in Ireland control over the police? I am perfectly sure that he is going to do nothing of the kind. I certainly shall regard it as a very grave thing if the noble Lord makes any such proposal. I have mentioned these two points to illustrate the rashness with which the noble Lord has committed himself to the principle of equality and similarity as between local government in Ireland and Great Britain. This I have to say, that if you extend the power of Local Authorities in Ireland, without a guiding and controlling central authority, you will increase and aggravate every mischief and every danger that now besets you. Your only course, if you wish to move safely in the path of the development of local self-government in Ireland, is to give a strengthening and guiding hand to the Local Authority. Nothing can be more misleading than to talk as if there was identity of position and spirit between Great Britain and Ireland, which ought to be carried out in identity of institutions. The conditions of Great Britain and of Ireland are in most respects absolutely different. There is difference of race. England is rich, Ireland is poor. England has a thoroughly united population; the population of Ireland is unfortunately not united. In England we have a great middle class; in Ireland there is scarcely a middle class at all. I might go on till I weary the House with the difference between Ireland and England on such points. In the face of all these differences in the very foundations of social order, it is the most misleading proposition that any statesman can advance—that an institution which is good for Great Britain is therefore good for Ireland. I humbly subscribe to what was quoted the other night by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby, from Mr. Disraeli, when he said that—"Almost the reverse of the institutions which are fitted for England is what are fitted for Ireland." I, for one, have been a partizan and an advocate of self-government for Ireland, because I believed that those proposals, and the self-government to which they would give rise, would give Ireland a strong Central Government, would not fritter away authority, and would not, as your proposals would, multiply the centres of resistance to, and attack on, the Imperial Parliament. The more this question is looked into, the more the difficulties are examined—enough has been said in this debate to show it —the more clearly will it be seen that we shall never get on the right line of improvement in Ireland—improvement in the relations between the people of Great Britain and the people of Ireland —until you give them a Statutory Parliament and an Executive Government responsible to it. You will never otherwise advance a step on the road towards a final and permanent settlement. I confess I was surprised to-night when my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale seemed to express some approval of these very limited and narrow proposals for local self-government for Ireland. For I had understood my noble Friend, in the later speeches which he delivered during the Election, to say that he was in favour of a central authority in Ireland, provided that it complied with four or five conditions which he enumerated. I cannot recognize my noble Friend's position taken in those last speeches of his, with the position of acquiescence in any proposals so narrow and meagre as those shadowed forth by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. One speech of his struck me immensely, because I thought I saw in a sentence of the noble Lord's the hopes of reconciliation between the views of my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham and our views. My noble Friend says that he felt that, after all that had been done and all that had been proposed by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, Ireland would require a measure of local self-government different from and wider than that which he thought would be sufficient for England. He repudiated equality and similarity. Therefore, I confess I am surprised and disappointed that, to-night, my noble Friend should not have a word of remonstrance to address to Her Majesty's Government when they take up a diametrically opposite position to that on which he won his election. When you say you have a mandate to preserve the Union, I acknowledge it to be quite true; and when you say that your first business is to preserve law and order, that is quite true also, if you can do it without more organic remedies than you have yet proposed. But when you say that the mandate of this House was confined to restoring and preserving law and order, and providing some small measure of local self-government, I defy you or your allies on this side of the House to prove that that was, in the least degree, the mandate of the constituencies at the last Election. Their mandate was, I admit, unfavourable to the proposals which we endeavoured to press on them; but, in my opinion, the judgment of the constituencies which returned Conservative Members and those who returned Unionist Liberals was, that the Government of the day, of whomsoever it might be composed, should take in hand as soon as possible a reconstruction of the Irish Government upon the broadest lines compatible with Parliamentary supremacy and Imperial unity. I say it is inevitable that circumstances will compel you to take the task in hand in that wide sense, and with that wide interpretation. Nay, further, and with this I have done—I say that the moment you advance along that road, the road which I believe the English and Scotch constituencies wish you to take, you will have to travel as far as we asked you to travel, and to bring in proposals which, however they may differ in detail, will be, in spirit and in principle, identical with those which we brought forward.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): Sir, there were two points decided by the late Election—one, that there shall be no Parliament in these Realms other than this one; and the other, that there shall be no impediment to this Government in maintaining law and order in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government, in the speeches we have heard, have shown firmness and frankness—qualities which were sadly absent when the affairs of the country were guided by the late Government; but I hope that the brave words of the Ministry before me will be followed by acts. Next, I desire to see a distinct principle laid down that there shall be no rival Executive in Dublin. It is quite true that, unless considerable firmness is shown in the present juncture, we shall drift back into the policy of the past. By the voice of the constituencies, the authors and avowers of the policy of fear have been relegated to a position which is more suitable to Gentlemen of their mettle; and, under these circumstances, I do not think that the present occupants of the Treasury Bench have any cause for alarm if they act fearlessly. I was particularly gratified to hear the declaration of Her Majesty's Government—that if the ordinary law proved insufficient for the maintenance of order in Ireland, they would not hesitate to have recourse to a November Session; and I am sure that many of us will willingly return from our avocations, in order to insure that the Queen's writ shall run without let or hindrance. One may call the best of dogs by a bad name, and hang him; but the equity of the English law will be none the less, because it is libelled by the name of coercion, which is but the authority of the law supporting its justice. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), a day or two ago, treated us to some extensive platitudes about the fundamental principles which he says have guided the Party to which he belongs; but, as a humble student of the distinguished and somewhat notorious career of the right hon. Gentleman, I have failed to find in his political action any other principles than those of the Vicar of Bray. I venture to think that those who sit on the Treasury Bench need not be afraid of the principles of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby with regard to remedies of Irish grievances. I think the time has come when an end should be put to the state of affairs that has existed, and I sincerely trust that the Government will set their faces completely against the policy of the past. Much has been said of the magnitude of the Irish Question. Now, it seems to me that the magnitude of a question in public or private life depends very much in the way in which it is treated. There are some people who, so to speak, are afraid of their own shadow; and, certainly, I think that one may look at a question too long, and thus become very liable to exaggerate its magnitude. I trust that Her Majesty's Government and the nation will look at this question in its true proportions. There is one point on which I agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. John Morley)—and I might say that he has almost taken the words out of my mouth. I think the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer was perhaps a little too hasty in using the word "equality." Now, I am of the opinion of the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, that, however much we may wish it, we cannot deal with Ireland on an equality with Great Britain. We hope the time may come when we shall be able to do that; but it has not yet arrived. It is true that the Poor Law has not been administered as impartially as as some of us could wish; and I have heard it said that the Poor Law authorities have used their position for some purposes totally different from the objects of their office. Again, much ignorance exists amongst the people in Ireland, and while they remain so illiterate it is hardly likely that we can place them on the same footing as we are ourselves. Finally, I hope the Government will go forward with their policy and set us the example of doing what they think is right in this matter, even if they should be in a minority.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

——o——

BEER ADULTERATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cuthbert Quilter, Bill for better securing the purity of beer, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cuthbert Quilter, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Lord Elcho, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Wolmer, and Mr. Francis Stevenson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 19.]

DIVORCE (LAW OF EVIDENCE AMENDMENT) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Henry Howorth, Bill to amend the Law of Evidence in cases of Divorce by enacting that the confession of either party made out of court shall be inadmissible as Evidence in the Suit, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Henry Howorth, Mr. Gent-Davis, and Mr. R. Mowbray.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 20.]

LEASEHOLDERS (PURCHASE OF FEE SIMPLE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lawson, Bill to give facilities to Leaseholders of houses and cottages for the Purchase of the Fee Simple of their holdings, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Thomas Ellis, and Mr. Puleston.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 21.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Saunderson, Bill to amend "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Saunderson and Mr. T. W. Russell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 22.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CLOSING OF PUBLIC HOUSES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shirley, Bill for Closing all Public Houses on the polling day in Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Shirley, Mr. Quilter, Mr. Gane, and Mr. T. W. Russell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 23.]

LINEN (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Act of the fifth and sixth years of William the Fourth, chapter twenty-seven, to continue and amend certain regulations for the Linen and Hempen manufactures in Ireland.

Resolution *reported*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Macartney, Colonel Saunderson, and Colonel Waring.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 24.]

RAILWAY FREIGHTS BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Nolan, Bill to secure equal rights of Railway Freight to the Agriculturists, Manufacturers, and others of Great Britain and Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Nolan, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Richard Power, and Mr. Marum.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 25.]

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stack, Bill for the temporary suspension of Evictions in certain cases in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stack, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Finucane, and Mr. O'Doherty.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 26.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS EXPENSES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Finucane, Bill to amend the Law relating to Expenses at Parliamentary Elections in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Finucane, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Tuite, and Mr. Maurice Healy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 27.]

BELFAST GOVERNMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Kelly, Bill for the better Government of Belfast, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Sexton. Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gray, and Mr. Biggar.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 28.]

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. P. J. Power, Bill for the better Government of Counties in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor, and Mr. Maurice Healy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 29.]

VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE.

Ordered, That the Committee to inquire into the Ventilation of the House be re-appointed:—Committee *nominated* of,—Dr. FARQUHARSON, Sir HENRY ROSCOE, Mr. LYELL, Sir GUYER HUNTER, Mr. ISAACS, Mr. RICHARD POWER, Mr. CYRIL FLOWER, Mr. TATTON EGERTON, and Mr. PLUNKET, with power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee in the last Parliament be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

PRINTING.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House:—Committee nominated of,—Sir JOSEPH PEASE, Mr. STANSFELD, Mr. RAIKES, Mr. WHITBREAD, Sir GEORGE RUSSELL, Mr. PARNELL, Colonel TOTTENHAM, Mr. SEXTON, Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, and Mr. JACKSON.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Alexander Blane, Bill to amend "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Alexander Blane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Sir Thomas Esmonde, and Mr. Leahy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 30.]

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Richard Power, Bill to amend the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Richard Power, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Sheehy, and Mr. Sexton.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 31.]

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Leahy, Bill to amend the Law relating to Municipal Franchise in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Leahy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Sir Thomas Esmonde, and Mr. Tuite.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 32.]

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Bill to make better provision for University Education in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Commins, and Dr. Fox.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 33.]

ALLOTMENTS AND SMALL HOLDINGS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jesse Collings, Bill to facilitate the creation of Allotments and Small Holdings of Land, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, and Mr. Pitt-Lewis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 34.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 24*th August*, 1886.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Public Petitions, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered — First Reading* — Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry * [35]; Open Spaces and Recreation Grounds (Dublin) * [36]; Railway Regulation * [37]; Ballot Act (1872) Amendment * [38].

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

QUESTIONS.

MAURITIUS—THOMAS WILKINSON.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Supreme Court of Mauritius has annulled an order of expulsion against Thomas Wilkinson, made by Mr. Pickersgill, Vice Consul at Tananrive; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table any report of the proceedings in and judgment of the Supreme Court?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I have not received any official information of the result of the action brought by Mr. Wilkinson; but from reports in the newspapers I gather that the Court gave judgment for the plaintiff with nominal damages and costs. I see no reason for putting the country to the expense of printing proceedings which do not seem to me to possess any public interest.

LAW OF TRADE MARKS—THE INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONVENTION.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If Her Majesty's Government will introduce, as soon as practicable, a Bill to amend the Law of trade marks, and to provide against the false marking of goods sold in the United Kingdom, in accordance with the recommendations of the Master Cutler of Sheffield and other British delegates to the recent International Industrial Convention held at Rome?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Her Majesty's Government have no intention of proposing any legislation of a general character during the present Session. Though at present I am unable to give any undertaking with regard to future legislation, I may state for the information of the hon. Member that the administration of the Trade Marks Acts, and the representations in favour of the amendment thereof which have been laid before the Board of Trade, are receiving, and will continue to receive, the careful consideration of the Department.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside) observed that the Question did not refer to the administration of the law, but as to whether the Board of Trade would introduce the Merchandise Marks Bill of last Session?

BARON HENRY DE WORMS said, he was unable to give any pledge as to the legislation of next Session, but could only repeat that the matter was receiving, and would continue to receive, the careful attention of the Board of Trade.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT: In consequence of the answer of the hon. Gentleman, I shall repeat the Question on this day fortnight.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONTEMPT OF COURT—THE CASE OF SARAH KEDART.

MR. ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorgan, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Sarah Kedart, who for eighteen months has been detained in Cardiff Gaol for contempt of court; whether he is aware that the plaintiff (her late husband) in the suit in which she was committed for contempt of court has since died; and, whether he will, considering the long duration of Sarah Kedart's imprisonment and her advanced age (seventy years), recommend Her Majesty to order her release?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, East), in reply, said, that Sarah Kedart had been attached for contempt in disobeying an order of the Queen's Bench Division, by which she was commanded to give up the deeds of a certain house. She had refused to comply with that order, and by reason of her contempt had been committed to prison. The Home Office could not interfere with orders of that sort. Application must be made to the Queen's Bench. The husband of Sarah Kedart was no party to the cause, and his death since her committal, though distressing, was not material to the case.

THE FISCAL LAWS—DUTIES ON IMPORTED MANUFACTURES.

MR. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any changes in the fiscal laws of the country by placing duties on imported manufactures, by taxing foreign corn, by countervailing bounties, or in any other respect?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Yes, Sir; I am glad to be able to state for the information of the hon. Member that the Ways and Means for the year 1887-8, which the Government will propose to Parliament, will be communicated to the House on or about, I should think, the 31st of March next by the person, whoever he may be, who at the time happens to be Chancellor of the Exchequer.

LOCAL TAXATION—THE COUNTY RATE — CONTRIBUTIONS BY TOWNS HAVING SEPARATE QUARTER SESSIONS.

MR. POWELL-WILLIAMS (Birmingham, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will institute the inquiry, promised by the late Government, into the subject of the contributions to the County Rate now paid by towns having separate Quarter Sessions?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, East), in reply, said, that the subject was one of very great complexity, and was deserving of inquiry. He could not undertake to issue the Commission suggested last year by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert); but he would undertake that in connection with Local Government the whole matter should be fully considered.

REGIMENTAL BANDS AT POLITICAL MEETINGS AND PUBLIC FESTIVALS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is aware that a band of the Royal Artillery at Woolwich played at a "Unionist Fête" at Walthamstow on 4th August; and, whether this was in accordance with the Rule prohibiting bands of regiments taking part in political demonstrations?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am informed that the application for the attendance of the band was for a garden party at the house of a gentleman who had obtained its services in the three previous years for purely private parties. Shortly, however, after his arrival, the bandmaster, seeing flags and other decorations which led him to suppose that the meeting might have some political character, after a short interval withdrew his band before any speeches were made, and the band therefore took no part in any political demonstration.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether the regulations forbidding the attendance of military bands at political gatherings applied to Yeomanry bands? He asked this Question, because he saw that the band of the Shropshire Yeomanry contemplated playing at a dancing *fête* of the Primrose League.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that he would make inquiry.

ADMIRALTY—DISCHARGE OF WORKMEN AT HAULBOWLINE.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is a fact that, since the 29th of last month, 50 men have been discharged from the new dock works at Haulbowline; how many years the present works have been in progress; at what date the works were first sanctioned; when, or about what time, is there any reasonable expectation of the works being completed; whether the principal dock is proportionately adequate for the reception of any of the first, second, or even third class ships of war in the Royal Navy; for what particular class of vessels are the docks intended; whether stone cutters are obliged to be employed to re-cut stones which failed to fit after being landed at Haulbowline; and if so, who is to blame; whether the boats in use for the purpose of conveying the shore labourers to and from the works would be seaworthy in tempestuous weather; whether four shipwrights, who have been employed in keeping these boats in good repair, have received notice of discharge; whether the skilled labour of shipwrights is necessary for securing the safety of the men working beneath at the river entrance to the docks; whether they have been constantly employed in making and repairing the waggons in daily use; and, whether, bearing in mind the great depression, the times, and the cheapness of labour, the Admiralty will advocate the re-employment of the men discharged, and the pressing forward of the works to completion?

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT) (Sheffield, Ecclesall) (who replied) said: Only four men have been discharged since July 29 from the dock works at Haulbowline. The present works have been 21 years in progress, having been sanctioned in 1865. They will be completed in 1888. The dock is adequate for the reception of the ships intended—namely, first-class ships of the Royal Navy, including the *Inflexible.* The stone in stock is cut to meet alterations in plan, not defects in stone delivered, and no blame attaches to anyone. The boats are maintained in good order for the service required. Of four shipwrights under notice of discharge only one was employed on these boats. Shipwrights are not required for securing the safety of the men working at the river entrance. They have not been constantly employed in making or repairing waggons, but may have occasionally so worked. The works are being completed as fast as the annual grant will allow; but as they are drawing to a close there is no other course open but gradually to discharge the workmen when they are no longer required.

DR. TANNER asked if the discharge of the shipwrights was not constantly arising, and that they were men whose services were required to preserve the lives of the men engaged in the works?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, only one shipwright was required for the boats. If any complaint could be brought and substantiated he would take care that it was attended to.

DR. TANNER gave Notice that he should raise the question again upon the Estimates.

IRELAND—DUBLIN PORT—DUES ON FISHING BOATS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the President of the Board of Trade, If the "port dues" imposed by the Dublin Port and Docks Board on fishing boats from Arklow, Howth, Dungarvan, and other places on the coast of Ireland, can be diminished so as to allow the fishermen to dispose of their fish at a profit in Dublin?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: The application of the funds referred to by the hon. Baronet is at the disposal of the Dublin Port and Docks Board; and I have accordingly forwarded a copy of the Question to the Board for any observations they may have to make on the subject.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—UNSANITARY CONDITION OF THE RATHDOWN UNION WORKHOUSE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If any steps can be taken to remedy the state of things caused by the defective drainage of the Rathdown Union Workhouse?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, the matter was one which concerned the Board of Guardians, and he understood their attention was now being directed to the subject. The Government could not interfere unless it was found absolutely necessary to do so.

ARMY — CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the fact, as stated in a letter written by Mr. Armit to the Under Secretary of State for War, dated 26th July last, and published in *The Admiralty and Horse Guards Gazette* of the 31st July, that certain officials connected with the Ordnance Department were, at the time of their connection with the Public Service, shareholders in a firm of contractors for the manufacture of ordnance; and, if such was the case, whether the Government have issued such instructions as will prevent the recurrence of such a state of affairs?

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Sir William Armstrong and Captain Andrew Noble, C.B., both directors and very large shareholders in "Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company," the Government Contractors for Ordnance, are or have been "associated" members of the Ordnance Committee on the Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the cause of the bursting of the 43-ton gun on board H.M.S. *Collingwood;* whether Sir Frederick Abel, the Chemist to the War Department, is not a member of the Ordnance Committee, and at the same time a shareholder to a considerable extent in the said "Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company;" and, whether General Sir Frederick Campbell, R.A., late Director of Artillery and Stores, was not at one time also a shareholder in "Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company," while holding an official appointment under Government?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In reply to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth (Sir William Crossman), and also to that of the hon. and gallant Member for Rochester (Colonel Hughes Hallett), I have to state that Sir William Armstrong and Captain A. Noble, C.B., and also Mr. Gledhill, of Sir Joseph Whitworth and Co., have been associated with the Ordnance Committee for the special inquiry into the cause of the bursting of the gun on board Her Majesty's ship *Collingwood*, which was made at Woolwich. Sir William Armstrong and Captain Noble and Mr. Leece (of Sir Joseph Whitworth's firm) were requested in February, 1885, by the Secretary of State to act as associate members of the Ordnance Committee on the construction of ordnance. They are not ordinary members of the Ordnance Committee, and only sat on occasions when, by the direction of the Secretary of State, they were especially requested to do so. Sir Frederick Abel is not a regular member of the Ordnance Committee, but is associated therewith for inquiries connected with explosives. He was also associated with the Committee for the special inquiry above mentioned. He is, I am informed, a shareholder in Sir William Armstrong, Mitchell, and Co. As regards Sir Frederick Campbell, I have no information at hand which will enable me to state whether he was or was not a shareholder in the Company named at the time he was employed at the War Office; but, if necessary, I can inquire. I can only repeat what I said yesterday—that if any hon. Member or any other person in or out of this House has any charge whatever to bring against any member of the Ordnance Department, or any other officer serving in the War Office, I shall be glad to receive it, and I will undertake that it shall receive the due consideration of the Law Officers of the Crown. I again repeat that a tribunal competent to adjudicate upon it shall be found.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN: Allow me to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that he has not answered the latter part of my Question—namely, whether there are any regulations to prevent members connected with the Ordnance Committee from holding partnerships in firms having ordnance contracts?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I really am not able to say that any officer is not at liberty to invest his money in any Company he may think fit. But he is not at liberty to use any power which he possesses for his own personal advantage or for the advantage of any Company with with he is connected. I think the hon. and gallant Member will see that it would be utterly out of the power of any Secretary of State—and, indeed, he has no authority to do so—to lay down any regulations as to the investment of the private property of any officer serving the Crown.

INDIA—ANNUAL REMOVAL OF THE GOVERNMENT TO HILL STATIONS.

Sir ROPER LETHBRIDGE (Kensington, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the great public meetings held at Calcutta, Lahore, and other places in India, to protest against the annual migration of Indian Governments to hill stations, and whether any action will be taken by the Government of India to meet the wishes of the people of India, both Native and European, on this subject; and, whether he is aware that a Return was ordered by this House on 30th July 1884, showing the cost of the annual migration, and whether that Return has ever been printed?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): Her Majesty's Government have received no official information respecting the public meetings held at Calcutta and other places in India to protest against the annual migration of the Indian Governments to hill stations; nor have they received any intimation of the views and intentions of the Government of India relating thereto. I am aware that a Return, showing the cost of the annual migration, was ordered by the House of Commons on July 30, 1884. That Return was made on July 5, 1885; but the House has not yet ordered it to be printed.

Sir ROPER LETHBRIDGE gave Notice that, in consequence of the answer given by the hon. and learned Gentleman, he should move that the Return in Question be printed.

IRELAND (SOUTH WEST DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER.

Mr. E. R. RUSSELL (Glasgow, Bridgeton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What will be the official relation between General Sir Redvers Buller and the Inspector General; and, whether the powers of the Inspector General will be curtailed in consequence of General Buller's appointment?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): There will be no curtailment of the powers of the Inspector General in consequence of Sir Redvers Buller's appointment. The relations between the Inspector General and Sir Redvers Buller will be, as I understand them, precisely the same as the relations which now exist between the Inspector General and Captain Plunket.

POST OFFICE—"CLERKS IN WAITING"—"TABLE MONEY."

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Postmaster General, If he will state the nature of the services in consideration of which it is proposed to pay an aggregate sum of £855 (besides "Table Money") during the present financial year in additional allowances to certain high-salaried officials of the Secretary's Department, for acting as "Clerks in Waiting;" and, what was the aggregate sum paid to these officers for "Table Money" during the last financial year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I have to inform him that it is necessary in the Post Office to have an experienced officer on duty each night and all through the night, and also throughout Sunday, to attend to any affairs of urgency or difficulty which may arise. This officer must be in a position to act for the Postmaster General and deal with all matters requiring special and immediate direction. Provision is made in the Estimates for this special duty. The authorized rate for "table money" is as stated in the Estimates, 10*s.* a day, which amounts to £182 10*s.* a year.

THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—TRUSTEES OF GOODFELLOW'S CHARITY, CO. DORSET.

Mr. JESSE COLLINS (Birmingham, Bordesley) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether he is aware that the Trustees of Goodfellow's Charity, in the parish of Fifehead, Neville, in the county of Dorset, are offering for sale the land belonging to the Charity; that the labourers of the parish have made application to the Trustees to rent this land, according to the provisions of "The Allotments Extension Act, 1882;" that the labourers have formally protested against the proposed sale, as a violation of the Act of 1882, which instructs the Trustees to offer the land for allotments; and, whether the Charity

Commissioners will request the Trustees to stop the sale until an inquiry has been made into the circumstances of the case?

The VICE PRESIDENT (Sir Henry Holland) (Hampstead): It is true that the trustees have applied to the Commissioners for their sanction to the sale of five acres of land belonging to Goodfellow's Charity, and the Commissioners directed the publication of the usual notices for eliciting any objection to the sale. So far as the Commissioners are aware the labourers have not directly applied to the trustees, as a body, to rent the land in allotments. The Commissioners have received from the labourers several protests against the sale; but it is not asserted in any of them that the proposed sale is a violation of the Act of 1882. No order of the Board, without which the sale cannot proceed, will be made until the circumstances of the case have been further inquired into, and, if necessary, by an Inspector.

POST OFFICE — ACCELERATION OF THE SCOTCH MAILS.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) asked the Postmaster General, If he intends to comply with the prayer of the various Memorials from Wick, Thurso, and the other towns in the North of Scotland for an acceleration of the down London day mail and the Scotch night mail, which now reaches Wick at 5 p.m., being only one hour and ten minutes before the arrival of the London night mail, although the day mail leaves London ten and a half hours before the night mail, thus wasting more than nine hours on the journey?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL, (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): Memorials have been recently received from Wick and other towns in the North of Scotland praying for an acceleration of the mail which now reaches Wick at 5 p.m., and the subject is now under inquiry. I cannot, of course, say until the reports are before me whether it will be possible to comply with the Memorials or not.

BULGARIA—RECENT REVOLUTION

Mr. BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give the House any further information as to the course of affairs in Bulgaria?

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked whether Her Majesty's Government are in possession of any information, beyond that which has appeared in the public prints, which they can give the House regarding the recent events in Bulgaria?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government are not in possession of much more information than has been furnished by the newspapers. Direct communication with Sofia is at present interrupted. They have, however, a report despatched by the Acting Agent and Consul General stating that at 3 on Saturday morning a detachment of Infantry surrounded the Palace and secured the person of Prince Alexander, who is said to have signed an abdication. His Highness was taken to the War Office, and at 5 o'clock was conveyed under a guard to an unknown destination and a Provisional Government formed. Her Majesty's Government are watching the course of events in Bulgaria with very great anxiety. At present I think it best to confine my statement to facts of which we have authentic knowledge.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co. Mid) asked whether it was true that one of the Great Powers had been active in promoting the success of the policy undertaken in Bulgaria, and what steps Her Majesty's Government proposed to take in the matter?

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: This Question was put into my hands as I entered the House, and I think I should be guilty of great levity if I gave any answer to it.

AFGHAN DEMARCATION COMMISSION.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any arrangement has been arrived at with the Russian Government for the discussion and settlement of the questions which remain to be determined regarding the frontier of Afghanistan?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government have come to an arrangement with the Russian Government that the Commission, having completed the demarcation of the Afghan frontier as far as Dukchi, shall separate. As regards the remaining portion of the frontier, matters will remain *in statu quo* pending a settlement by the two Governments.

VENEZUELA—SEIZURE OF THE SHIPS "HENRIETTA" AND "JOSEPHINE"—CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the expected Despatch from Venezuela, respecting the claims of British subjects arising out of the outrages committed on the crews and passengers of the ships *Henrietta* and *Josephine*, and the illegal seizure of those ships, has been received; whether the amount of the claim made on their behalf by the British representative in Venezuela was not, by his error, understated, and why such error was refused rectification; whether, and when, the papers promised by the late Under Secretary on the subject will be laid before Parliament; and, what is proposed to be done by the present Government to ensure justice being done to British subjects and British commerce in the matter?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Yes, Sir, that despatch has been received, and will be included in the Papers on the subject of Venezuelan claims which have already been laid upon the Table, and will be immediately distributed. I have learnt on inquiry that the claims on behalf of the crews and passengers of the *Henrietta* and *Josephine* were stated at a lower rate than that claimed by the persons concerned, after being assessed by the British Minister in Venezuela in communication with the Governor of Trinidad and the British Vice Consul at La Guaira; but any errors in the items of claim can be rectified when the time arrives for verifying and discussing them. The Venezuelan Government have declined to admit the validity of the claims, and a further communication is about to be made to them, which it is hoped may induce them to reconsider their decision.

RICHMOND PARK—TRICYCLES AND BICYCLES.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he can hold out any hope that Richmond Park will be opened for the use of cyclists, equally with persons using other vehicles, before the whole of the Summer has passed away?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I hope that within a few days cyclists will be admitted, equally with persons using other vehicles, into Richmond Park. New rules to that effect were completed on Saturday last, and so soon as they have obtained the signature of His Royal Highness the Ranger they shall be laid upon the Table of the House with as little delay as possible.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT—DISCHARGE OF A CLERK.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether a clerk in the Telegraph Department was recently discharged after five years' exemplary service, for the sole reason that he had not attained the height of five feet four inches?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that it is not the case that a clerk in the Telegraph Department has been dismissed after five years' service for the reason that he had not attained the height of 5 feet 4 inches. The facts are as follows:—The lad referred to was a telegraph boy messenger, and was not a member of the established staff. The regulations prescribe that these lads should cease to be boy messengers at the age of 19, when their service terminates. They are, however, eligible for nomination for the established situation of sorter or postman, for which, if they can pass the required standard of height—5 feet 4 inches—they have to obtain a Civil Service certificate. As the lad referred to was under the standard of height, he was ineligible for nomination. He might, if he had so elected, have become a candidate under the age of 18 for the situation of telegraphist, for which situation no standard of height is required.

WEST INDIES—ISLAND OF JAMAICA—ALLEGED DEPREDATIONS BY A SPANISH MAN-OF-WAR.

SIR JOHN SIMON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any information had been received at the Colonial Office respecting the conduct of certain Spanish men-of-war off the coast of Jamaica in boarding vessels off British waters, and in one instance sending armed men on board a vessel taking in cargo within a hundred yards from the shore, and in another actually landing armed men at the port of St. Anne, under the pretext of searching for Cuban insurgents; and what steps are to be taken to prevent the recurrence of such gross breaches of International Law?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The Governor of Jamaica has reported that the boats of a Spanish gunboat have boarded British vessels in British waters off the Northern Coast of Jamaica, and that the crews have occasionally landed on the Island with arms. The Governor had, on receiving this intelligence, informed the Spanish Consul at Kingston that such proceedings could not be permitted, and the captain of the Spanish gunboat had been similarly warned by the Commander of Her Majesty's ship *Goshawk*. The Spanish gunboat had left the North side of the Island and gone to Kingston, and the Governor did not anticipate any repetition of the acts complained of.

MOTION.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MOTION FOR THE ADDRESS.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. PARNELL suggested that it would be more convenient to extend the Motion beyond to-morrow, or otherwise it might be necessary to repeat it on Friday or even next Tuesday if the debate on the Address was not then concluded. He should also like to know how Her Majesty's Government proposed to treat the Bill which the Attorney General for Ireland had given Notice he would introduce that evening. Was it intended to put it down for second reading to-morrow or the day after to-morrow? He thought it very likely that the second reading stage of the Bill would be opposed, and unless provision were made for the second reading the question would arise on Thursday.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) Paddington, S.): I cannot contemplate at present any such contingency as the prolongation of the debate on the Address till next Tuesday. For all the present purposes of the House the Motion now made is adequate, as it is usual. With regard to the Bill referred to by the hon. Member, of course, if it is to meet with anything like protracted and stubborn opposition the Government will have to consider seriously whether it will be in their power to press it on the House at the present time; but if the opposition which the hon. Member seems to think might occur would be only for the purpose of raising a discussion on the principle or scope of the Bill, then, undoubtedly, the Government would endeavour to bring it on at an hour before the time after which opposed Business cannot be taken. Of course, the Bill will not be put down for second reading till it has been printed and circulated.

MR. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland whether it is his intention to move for leave to introduce his Bill for facilitating the proceedings of the Belfast Commission, and, if so, whether he will make a statement on his Motion of the provisions of the Bill?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: Yes, Sir, it is my intention to make the Motion, and if it suits the convenience of the House I shall state the provisions of the Bill.

MR. SEXTON: Will the Motion for the second reading of the Bill be made after the debate on the Address?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Yes, certainly.

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [19th August.]—[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. PARNELL (Cork): Mr. Speaker, I am strongly disposed to demur—in fact, I think it is my duty to demur—to the inference which has been so freely drawn in this debate, and which has been alluded to in the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, as to the result of the recent Elections. I myself do not feel at all that the question of Irish self-government has been disposed of, much less finally disposed of, by the recent appeal to the country. In looking at the results of that appeal, I see that Her Majesty's present Government have been returned to power not as the Representative of the majority of the country, and certainly not as the Representatives of a majority of the House. I see that they are only in Office, and that they can only remain in Office on sufferance—on the sufferance of a certain number of Liberal Members of this House who call themselves Liberal Unionists; and only so long as that section of Members determine that the Irish Question—that the withholding of the right of self-government from Ireland—is more important to the interests of the Empire than all other English and Imperial questions put together. Now, Sir, I do not think that that time can last very long. Ireland is a very small and insignificant country. She has been able, of course, to give a great deal of trouble; but it cannot be pretended that the necessity of bullying and keeping down Irish national aspirations is of such importance as to require that the people of England, in their great domestic and Imperial concerns, should continue to be directed and governed by a Tory policy. In my judgment, the time will come, sooner or later, when the people of this country will signify, in no very doubtful fashion, to that section of the Liberal Party who are keeping the Tories in power and enabling the Tories to govern not only Ireland, but England and the Empire at large, that their patience has been exhausted, and that their desire that England should cease to be governed by the reactionary factions and the Tories, and that the great results of the extension of the franchise to the masses should be allowed to have their full play. As regards our own position, we have every reason to feel, I will not say satisfied with the result of the General Election, but certainly satisfied with our present position. For the first time in the history of the Irish national movement a large section, the great majority, of the Liberal Party have declared at the polls that Ireland is entitled to autonomy. That declaration has been endorsed in the country by the great majority of the Liberal electors — the vast majority. If I look at the Election Returns, I find that the Conservative Party were in no instances helped by anything but an insignificant section of the Liberal voters in the constituencies. I find, on the other hand, that where the Tories gained seats, it was due to hesitation on the part of a considerable section of the Liberal electorate. I am not surprised that they should have shown this hesitation, in view of the extraordinary attempts made to deceive them, and to raise false issues; and in view of the great weight which was lent to such false issues by such men as the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), and the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for another Division of Birmingham (Mr. John Bright). I am not in the least surprised that there was sufficient hesitancy on the part of a section of the Liberal Party, so as to enable the Tory Gentlemen opposite to take their seats on the Treasury Bench; but I do not think that if the Elections were to take place now, you would see such a result. I do not believe that if even three weeks' more time had been given for fuller examination of this question, the Tory Party would have been able to profit by that hesitation. Certainly, after the present Government have exhibited themselves as a spectacle for gods and men for a year or two, in their attempt to govern Ireland, I am convinced that there will be no such hesitation, so that we have every reason to be patient. We have every reason, as the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, the senior Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley), said the other evening, to be moderate, and to urge on our people at home to be moderate, and to keep them within the limits of loyalty, as far as any advice of ours can possibly so keep them, because ours is a winning cause. It can only be damaged by excesses of any kind; and if the speeches which have been made from the Treasury Bench and in "another place" within the last day or two have been intended to exasperate Ireland, then I believe they will very seriously fall short of their effect. At the same time, I am bound to say that there must be considerable difficulty in that country in the coming winter on the question of rent; and I seriously regret that the Government have not appeared to estimate, at its full gravity, the position in Ireland with regard to this matter. They talk of issuing a Royal Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the question. But such a Commission cannot possibly report until the winter has gone over, and it is in the winter when the pinch must arise. I shall refer more fully to this branch of the question a little later on; but I would wish to say that the Government, although they have put forward a Speech from the Throne of a non-committal character, have not followed up that Speech in their explanations to both Houses of Parliament. On the contrary, they have foreshadowed—all the principal speakers who have addressed Parliament on the part of the Government have foreshadowed—very extensive changes in the law of the land. In addition to announcing a policy of what they call firm administration of the law in Ireland, they have also announced, and they have very boldly foreshadowed, very extensive changes in the law of the land. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), and, last night, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), have all, in the most unhesitating and unqualified manner, announced that the policy of the Government with regard to the land in Ireland will be to substitute for the dual ownership established by the Land Act of 1881 a system of single ownership by the occupying tenants. Now, Sir, that is a policy which cannot be carried out except with the expenditure of a vast sum of money. I have made my estimate in times past as to what would be a reasonable sum to spend on a settlement of the Land Question by purchase, and I put it at £100,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), I think, placed it at £150,000,000. [MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: £113,000,000.] £113,000,000! But the leading Members of the Conservative Party, in their speeches in the country last year, placed it at £250,000,000. And if there is to be this radical alteration in the settlement attempted to be made by the Land Act of 1881, if—in the words of Lord Salisbury, of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of the Chief Secretary for Ireland—the system of dual ownership in Ireland is be replaced by one of single ownership, it can only be replaced, and, certainly, it can only be replaced under a Tory Government, by the expenditure of very vast sums of money at the risk or expense of the English taxpayer. My position has always been a perfectly clear one in respect to this matter. Perhaps I shall be told that I agreed to the Land Purchase Act of 1885; but I did not agree to it with coercion in prospect. I agreed to it because I believed that a settlement of the National Question was about to come concurrently with a settlement of the Land Question. I agreed to it because the Government of which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and Lord Salisbury, were Members, had sent over to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant an avowed Home Ruler, whom they knew to be an avowed Home Ruler, whom they knew to be in favour of a separate Constitution for Ireland. ["Order, order!"]

SIR WILLIAM HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I rise to Order. I cannot allow it to be stated—["Order, order!"]—by any hon. Gentleman—["Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question of Order. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork is in possession of the House, and the right hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity of making any correction afterwards.

MR. PARNELL: Well, Sir, if Lord Salisbury did not know that Lord Carnarvon was a Home Ruler, I wonder why he took such pains in the beginning of last July to tell Lord Carnarvon, on his acceptance of Office, that he had not yet arrived at the belief that Home Rule was possible for Ireland. And I wonder why Lord Salisbury was not able to say that he had ever expressed an opinion adverse to Home Rule to Lord Carnarvon after that time. I also wonder why Lord Salisbury, in his celebrated Newport speech, made pointed references to the settlement which had taken place between Austria and Hungary as a settlement which he feared might not be possible in Ireland, but which he hoped would be. At all events, that, Sir, was my main reason for supporting the Land Purchase Act of 1885. Circumstances are now, however, entirely changed. We have not Lord Carnarvon as Lord Lieutenant any longer. Why have we not Lord Carnarvon as Lord Lieutenant any longer? It is true, Sir, we have a Home Secretary who, in 1870, contributed £30 to the funds of the predecessor of the Irish National League—the Home Rule League—one of the principles of which Body was that no power except that of the Queen, Lords, and Commons of Ireland had any right to make laws for that country. Sir, I am very sure the right hon. and learned Gentleman has not changed his colours with his position, and that some day or other we shall have from him a bold, able, and eloquent justification of his real belief in the position which he then took. I sincerely hope we shall. But, Sir, to return to the Land Question. I would wish to say that the settlement of the question of the purchase of land in Ireland, concurrently with that of the national question proposed by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, would have been a safer one for the British taxpayer under the limitations and restrictions which were attached to it. Under those limitations and restrictions the Imperial authority would not have been obliged to come into contact in the process of the collection of rent with a single tenant. Every penny of the principal and interest required for the £50,000,000 would have been paid out of the Customs and Excise, which were all absolutely under the control of the Imperial authority, who would not in the collection of the money, which is as safe as the Bank of England, ever come in contact with a single labourer or tenant in Ireland. But what is the position taken up by the present Government? They contend that it is not quite safe to buy the congested estates in the West of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant tells us that he hopes in the future to establish a system by which Local Authorities in Ireland—to be also established hereafter—will be able to give county guarantees in order to protect the State from the risk of buying these rotten estates in the West of Ireland. That is a very kind offer indeed of the right hon. Gentleman to make to us. First, that he is going to establish Local Authorities who will be constituted in such a way as to be foolish enough to become guarantors for the purchase of these rotten estates, upon which there are, according to the letters of Sir James Caird, 528,000 tenants absolutely unable to pay any economical rent at all; and, secondly, that these estates are to be purchased. Well, Sir, if his local government is going to be in that shape, I should say that the less local government we have from the right hon. Gentleman the better. If he succeeds in establishing Boards in Ireland which, by a liberal infusion of the *ex officio* or landlord element, will be in a position to put taxes upon these impoverished counties in the West, the result will be no safer to the Imperial Exchequer than if he had not established these County Authorities, and nothing bearing a good effect will have been done at all. Sir, the Western counties in which these congested estates are situated are as poor as the estates themselves. The poor rates are often excessively high there, in many cases as much as 5*s.* in the £ of the total valuation. At times of exceptional pressure and distress they frequently run up to 10*s.*, and in the time of famine they went up to 20*s.* in the £. This, Sir, is the property which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to lay his hands on, under the guise of local government, and of securing, by a county guarantee, the Imperial Exchequer against loans for purchasing congested estates, a plan which would be absolutely valueless in the times of pressure which annually occur in Ireland. That is a portion of the policy of the Government. But another policy would be to purchase other estates not so valueless, and not in such congested districts. This is in action now under the Act of 1885, and I have seen some details of purchase which certainly make me believe that the transaction will not be a safe one for the Imperial Exchequer. Under that Act the landlord is entitled to guarantee one-fifth of the purchase money by allowing it to remain as a sort of security. The practice on the part of those representing the landlords, in some recent sales, I am informed, has been to say to the tenant—"If you offer to give a higher price than you think the land is really worth to the extent of that one-fifth, we will never call upon you to pay that one-fifth; we will allow you to repudiate that one-fifth." Is that a very safe way of commencing to deal with the tenantry, even on the most solvent of estates, leaving alone those in the congested districts? Should you commence by telling them almost absolutely to repudiate one-fifth of the purchase money? Sir, this idea of repudiation will become instilled into the mind of the tenantry—it will take root and extend beyond that one-fifth. I wish to clear my hands entirely of any responsibility in reference to the working of the Land Purchase Act of 1885, or any loss which may arise to the Imperial Exchequer hereafter, any loss which may arise from the proposed gigantic schemes of Land Purchase which the Government have foreshadowed, by saying that, in my opinion, in present circumstances the prices likely to be given by the tenants, under the pressure of what is called the stern enforcement of the law—perhaps, almost certainly, under the pressure of an additional Coercion Act next year—will have such an effect as to render it an exceedingly dangerous thing for the State to entertain the matter at all. What was suggested, Sir, by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, in my opinion, would in Ireland have been met with the united efforts of the people to pay the amount to the last penny. And, Sir, if the question of the settlement of the land is divorced from the National Question—if Sir, it is intended to alienate national feeling, it will be found that the Government will have got hold of a very thorny stick by the wrong end. I have myself, Sir, always desired a fair consideration of public money advances for Irish objects; because I believe that if the Land Question were once settled, the way would be made easier for the settlement of the national question of self-government; but I should certainly be most dishonest if, out of any desire to see the Land Question settled, I were to join in the designs which the Government appear to have upon the pockets of the British taxpayers when they announce, as has been done by Lord Salisbury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the judicial rents are sacred; that if they are too high they must be reduced, not at the loss of the landlords, but the loss of the Imperial Exchequer No, Sir; the honest policy is, that the land should pay as much as it can pay in fairness—that is, what it pays in England. The English landlords reduce their rents when a crisis such as that in Ireland comes upon them; they voluntarily reduce the rents 30 or 40 per cent. The land, in many cases, is thrown out of cultivation for want of tenants. The English landlords, Sir, do not come to the State and beg it to advance fabulous and gigantic sums, for the purpose of enabling them to keep up to the high level of judicial or any other rent. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant was put up manifestly to smooth and explain away the too candidly open utterances of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It appears to me, Sir, however, that he has succeeded in making the position of the Government worse; because, whilst he admitted that the question of rents that were not judicial rents should be a fair subject of negotiation between the landlords and tenants with a view to their reduction, he said the judicial rents could not be made the subject of any arrangement or reduction.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No; I did not say that.

MR. PARNELL: I do not know, then, what the meaning is of the extract which I shall read from the right hon. Gentleman's speech last night. If it be not that, I am afraid it has no meaning at all. He says—

> "There would be no difficulty in doing this in Ireland as in England; no difficulty in the cases where the tenants may find it impossible to pay their rents in the coming autumn, if landlords and tenants were free to make their own bargains for themselves. The Act of 1881 contained a provision meeting cases where the tenant whose rent has not been fixed by the Court may apply to have eviction stayed until the Court has adjudicated, and I know no reason why the Court should not act with perfect fairness in such a matter. Now, I come to another matter—the question of tenants holding under judicial rents. My noble Friend has already put before the House the position of this question. Under the Act of 1881 Commissioners were appointed; and can it be supposed that these Commissioners, who were considered amply qualified by the right hon. Gentleman opposite,

> fixed the judicial rents without taking into consideration the fact that the price of produce must necessarily vary? But was this a temporary or a permanent matter? We find the tenants, as I have already stated in reply to a Question, can afford to give enormous sums for the tenant right. These are matters which surely deserve grave consideration, especially by those who are responsible for the Land Act of 1881, before they undertake to say that the judicial rents were fixed so unfairly that when a fall in prices comes those rents must be revised. On the other hand, Her Majesty's Government have never, from the beginning of this matter, looked upon the Commissioners who have decided rents as infallible, either in their methods or in their knowledge of the question. We admit that it is possible that they may have been a good deal wrong; and, therefore, we include this matter in the inquiry which we propose. It is not for me to forecast what the result of that inquiry may be on either of the two points affecting the payment of rents specified for inquiry in that Commission."

Therefore, according to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the distinction is that the rent which is not a judicial rent may be settled between the landlord and tenant as it would be in England; but all questions affecting rents that have been judicially fixed must wait until the Commissioners have completed their inquiry. That, Sir, I consider to be a fair representation of the right hon. Gentleman's utterances. What will be the consequence? That is hard to say; but it is certain that the tenants who have relied upon this House and upon the efficacy of the Act of 1881 to put them in a secure position will be punished by the right hon. Gentleman because they have relied upon that measure, because they have applied to the Courts to fix their rents. Now that a great fall in prices has taken place, they are to be debarred from any relief, at all events before the Commission has sat and inquired, and afterwards they are not to be relieved by the lowering of the rents, but at the expense of the Imperial taxpayers. But what, Sir, about the tenants who remained out of Court in 1881, in obedience to the "No Rent" Manifesto, the tenants who have been fighting their way outside the Courts? Why, they are to be taken under the wing of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and are to be told that it is quite right and proper for them to bargain with their landlords, as tenants in England do, in order to obtain a reduction. If that is the way in which the Chief Secretary is going to teach the Irish tenant farmers and people to rely on the law of the land and the justice of this House he is on the wrong tack. Now, I want to say a few words about the appointment of General Buller. I would like to know if the Government intend that that officer should administer the civil or military power? Is he to have control of the magistracy? The Stipendiary Magistrates are gentlemen who have passed through a special study and training. They are acquainted with the law in Ireland; they know familiarly what the Civil Law is; and they have spent many years in acquiring their broad experience. Is General Buller to be given any opportunity of making himself acquainted with the law of the country which he is to administer? What has been his experience in the past? Has he ever administered the Civil Law in any country where that law existed? I never heard that he had. I rather think that his experience is confined to the administration of Military Law in savage countries where no law had ever existed, or where it had been superseded by that martial law which is the abolition of all law. *Inter arma silent leges*, and I suppose we shall be told that General Buller will be entitled to manufacture in Kerry a code of his own adapted to the situation. Has he any knowledge of the Civil and Criminal Law of Ireland, of the duties of the Constabulary, of the duties of the Resident and ordinary Magistrates? I do not wish to say a single word against the great gallantry and the military ability of this officer; but I cannot but think that the Kerry "Moonlighters" will think themselves highly complimented at having among them to effect their subjection so gallant a General, backed, as I suppose he will be, by a very considerable portion of the British Army. But I think we ought to know what is going to happen, and what he is going to do. Is he going to strain the Civil Law, or is he going beyond it; and, if so, do you intend to apply to Parliament for Acts of indemnity for such excess as was done in the Rebellion of 1798? That course was followed at that time; but even in Kerry things are not so bad as they were then. The Government have in their service many civil officers from among whom they might have chosen one for this special duty. They might, for instance, have recalled Mr. Clifford Lloyd from his Colonial post, where it is reported he is not getting on very well with his superior. But why poor General Buller should be selected, and be sent over to Kerry for the purpose of attempting to catch "Moonlighters," that is a thing beyond my comprehension. But I suppose that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his desire to introduce a new policy, desired also to do something startling. He has told us that he entirely disagrees with what he terms the traditional policy of the Liberal Party—namely, that the redress of grievances and the maintenance of social order are closely and intimately connected. But although he has told us that, he has rather shown his firm belief in the truth of that connection by appointing a Commission which is to inquire both into the question of social order and the question of agrarian legislation with regard to redress of grievances. The Commission is appointed to inquire into any combination which may exist to resist the enforcement of legal obligations, and also the fall in the price of produce. It is also to inquire to what extent there exists any general desire among the tenants to avail themselves of the provisions of the Land Purchase Act of 1885—that is to say, it is to inquire into the question of social order, and also to inquire into the question of agrarian legislation—two questions which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian has always contended are intimately connected, and which the experience of the history of all countries has shown to be intimately connected, but which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer denies there is any connection between whatever. Now, Sir, I want to ask the Government, with regard to the Royal Commission, as to its constitution. I wish to ask how soon they intend to inform the House as to the Members of which it is to be composed? Something may depend upon the constitution of this Commission; at all events, the matter appears to have been under the consideration of the Government for some time, and they surely will be in a position to inform the House now as to the constitution of such an important Body. I shall be glad to know if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is going to be a Member of it. The right hon. Gentleman was going to pay a visit to Ireland a year ago in another fashion—he was going to inquire, for his own information, in regard to the merits of the Irish Question. It will be very interesting for the right hon. Gentleman to go over to Ireland and complete the inquiry, which was shortened before by the ill-advised threat of Mr. Healy that they might duck him in a horse pond. He will have an opportunity now of going over under different auspices, and under the protection of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and he will not have the slightest risk of any such fate as that foreshadowed by Mr. Healy under the changed conditions. I should also like to know whether they think it right that Members of the Nationalist Party should serve on this Commission? It was announced that due regard would be had to the due representation on the Commission of all Parties and sections in Ireland; and I wish to know whether the National Party will have a representation to the extent of five-sixths of its number? I do not see in what other way you are to carry out the pledge made the other night by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in respect to this matter. But we are not only to have a Commission charged with the duty of inquiring into the Land Question, and we are not only to incur, in all probability, a vast future expenditure in connection with that question, under circumstances which yield but little hope of its ever being repaid—we are also to have a Commission appointed to consider the subjects of railways, tramways, roads, harbours, and the industrial resources of the country generally. You therefore contemplate committing the dishonesty of attempting to bolster up the system of landlord and tenant in Ireland by the expenditure of vast sums of public money, the repayment of which is quite uncertain and highly problematic; you propose to commit the folly of spending large sums of money in building harbours of refuge on the West Coast for fishing boats that do not exist; you propose to commit the folly of lowering the bed of the great arterial lines of drainage—the Shannon, the Suck, and the Barrow—at a cost of £750,000, when, according to the Report of the Committee which has already sat upon the subject, and the estimates of the chief engineer to the Board of Works in Dublin, the lowering of the bed of the River Suck alone would cost £650,000, and when the whole work must really involve an expenditure of fully £10,000,000. You propose, also, to commit the dishonesty of endeavouring to stimulate Irish manufactures by liberal doses of English public money. I believe, Sir, that the Irish people utterly refuse to sell their national birthright for a mess of pottage. I dare say the expenditure of the money will be very gratifying to many people—to people who live upon jobs. They will be very much pleased. I wonder why we have not heard of a project for cutting a tunnel through the Whinstone Rock, between Scotland and the North of Ireland, or making a ship canal through the Bog of Allen to Galway. However, I suppose the five harbours of refuge are sufficient for the present. But after you have spent all this English public money you purpose, you will have the satisfaction of finding that at least three-fourths of it will be absolutely wasted, and that you will not be thanked for your expenditure of the other fourth. You have not in Ireland, at the present moment, a single competent engineer in the Department. The Irish Board of Works has strewn the coasts with monuments of its ignorance and incompetence as an engineering body. I have myself some little knowledge of this question of the development of the industrial resources of Ireland, and I believe that the more State money there is given to such a purpose the less satisfactory will the result be. The best and only way to develop the industrial resources of Ireland is to allow the Irish people to do all these works themselves; and I think, having done them themselves, they should be allowed to have a right to the profit. This question of the influx of capital into Ireland, although we hear so much as to the necessity of it, is entirely beside the question. We do not want an influx of capital; we have got plenty of it of our own. What we want is to be allowed to keep the capital we have got in the country. At present, all the Irish capital comes over to England. There is scarcely an Irish bank that does not place five-sixths of its capital in this country. What we want is to be allowed to help ourselves. [*Laughter.*] Self-help according to Mr. Smiles, is one of the greatest of your national virtues, and I am surprised to hear English Gentlemen deride the idea. Certainly, no nation in the world is so conspicuous an example of the successful results arising out of self-help as the English nation. You have been allowed to help yourselves; you have been allowed to devote your own energies under your system of self-government in this House to the development of your own resources; but if you had some Pasha over in Constantinople, deciding what canals you should have cut, and what swamps should be drained, what sea lands should be reclaimed, what harbours of refuge established, you would have found the results less satisfactory, and you would probably have been in a worse condition with regard to these matters than you are to-day. These five harbours of refuge which are to be established on the West Coast, when they have been built at a vast cost—for I take it they will be constructed to admit vessels of large tonnage—will be found perfectly useless for fishing smacks. Everybody knows that fishing smacks require small harbours at small intervals. Fishermen do not require these gigantic harbours. They require harbours near their fishing grounds, and it is no advantage to them to have these large harbours 50 or 60 miles away. Such harbours of refuge, so far as the advantage of the fishing on the West Coast of Ireland is concerned, would be of very little advantage. The fishermen would require to be within easy access of the fishing ground, and to be able to run to a port near at hand. However, this is another example of the largeness of mind and breadth of view of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. We are to be treated to an entirely new policy from top to bottom, and if the poor British taxpayers suffer it cannot be helped but we have liberated our souls—we have declared we shall be no party to this fraud. It will be for Her Majesty's Government, having got into Office by misrepresentations—I will not add by wholesale lying—to continue their policy by establishing a vast system of corruption and bribery in Ireland, not by means of money taken out of their own pockets or of the candidates, but out of those of the unfortunate Imperial taxpayer. Now, Sir, I will turn to my Amendment; it has reference to the question of social order in Ireland and to the Land Question. My Amendment draws attention to the fact that there has been a very serious fall in the price of agricultural produce in Ireland; that this fall has taken place since the bulk of the judicial rents were fixed; that the Irish tenants, as a body, will experience considerable difficulty in the payment of their rents, and that many of them will be unable to pay these rents at all; that the rights which were given and guaranteed by the State to the Irish tenants under the Act of 1881 are likely to be confiscated, owing to the evictions of tenants; and that these evictions, if carried out, will cause wide-spread suffering and endanger the maintenance of social order. Further, Sir, I deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise in consequence of the inability of the tenant to pay the present rents from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they are now. Now, Sir, let me say a word as to the question of these judicial rents, and the difficulty in all cases, and the inability in many cases, of the tenants to pay them. It involves an admission to some extent that the rents are too high, at all events in the present season. Why are these rents too high? They are too high for several reasons. In the first place, they are too high because the House of Lords mutilated the Land Act of 1881, and destroyed, or nearly destroyed, all the value which existed in the Improvement Clauses of that Act. The rest of the value of these clauses, left by the House of Lords, was destroyed by the decision of the Supreme Court in Dublin in the celebrated case of "Adams *v.* Dunseath," where the majority of the Appeal Judges, being Tories, on a very narrow division carried judgment in favour of the landlord, and against the tenant. The Lord Chancellor, who piloted the Bill through this House, was one of the Judges, and voted in its favour. The decision of "Adams *v.* Dunseath" deprived the Improvement Clauses of the Land Act of any value that they had. The third reason why the Act of 1881 fixed rents too high was the weakness of the Land Commission, or rather the weakness of the portion of it which was supposed to be friendly to the tenant. There was a certain number of the Commissioners who were supposed to be friendly to the landlord, and a certain number who were friendly to the tenant. Judge O'Hagan and Mr. Litton, who were the friends of the tenants, allowed themselves to be browbeaten by the clamours of the Orange newspapers in Ireland and by their Colleagues to such an extent that the tenants lost all confidence in the fair administration of the Land Act of 1881. I think those three causes very clearly describe the reason why the rents fixed by that Act were too high, and have not given satisfaction. I regret very much that an opportunity was not taken to settle the Land Question under the principle of the Land Act. I fear that the opportunity may not come again so soon; that there may be much trouble, much distress, and some crime caused by the relations between landlord and tenant before the work that was commenced by the Land Act of 1881 is taken up again. But we have to deal with things as they stand, and we find that the rents fixed, owing to these three causes, are too high to allow the tenants to live and thrive. What is to be done? We cannot, in the present Session of Parliament, go into a revision of the Act of 1881, and I do not propose that in my demand. But the Government, even if they are unwilling to do anything, might at least have refrained from inciting the landlords to wholesale evictions. ["No, no!"] The language of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Salisbury, although somewhat modified by the language of the Chief Secretary for Ireland last night, gave the keynote for it. It can have no other effect. Evictions and outrage or agrarian crime in Ireland have always followed in each other's footsteps very closely; and if hon. Members will examine the statistics of eviction and outrage they will find that there is a very close correspondence in the relative numbers. They will find, for instance that in the county of Kerry, where there is so much complaint made, and justly made, of agrarian crime of a very terrible character, evictions are nearly as numerous as the whole of Munster put together, and the agrarian crime is in the same proportion. If they trace the thing they will find that in the counties where there are few evictions agrarian crime is almost unknown. You cannot deal with Ireland as though it were a country where agrarian crime is universal; because, according to the admission of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, agrarian crime is confined to Kerry and one or two districts in the South and West of Ireland, and it is in these districts you will invariably find that evictions have been pressed to their utmost. What is the belief of the people of Kerry with regard to this "Moonlighting?" Why do they refuse to give evidence? Why do they refuse to identify the men who come to their doors and batter them down, and take away arms, fire shots, and, in some cases, take money? If you ask the people you will find that it is from a universal belief that were it not for "Moonlighting" Lord Kenmare would not leave the roof over any of his tenants. That is not a justification of "Moonlighting;" but it is one of the causes of "Moonlighting." I do not wish to say that "Moonlighters" are entirely governed by considerations of the agrarian question; but it is the belief of the people that they are largely governed by these considerations, and that the "Moonlighters" constitute a protection for them against the rapacity of the landlord. They are, therefore, willing to allow them to levy black mail. This has often happened in other countries where the Constitution has been suspended or withheld. It happened in the Southern States of America after the suppression of the rebellion. The Federal Government refused to restore the Constitution to the States that rebelled. They said that they were not fitted for self-government, and that they would be a danger to the Union if their Constitution was restored; they said, in effect, what the Liberal Unionists and the Members of the Government were saying up and down the country during the General Election; and on this pretext they suspended the Constitution of the Southern States, and gave them a somewhat similar Government to that which you have in Ireland. They had what is known as a "carpet-bagging Government." They sent people from the North who had no connection with the country, and who, coming with a very small amount of goods, got the name of "carpet-baggers." Well, one consequence of that was that a secret conspiracy strikingly resembling, in many of its features, the different secret conspiracies which have existed from time to time in Ireland—the old Whiteboy conspiracy and the present "Moonlighting" conspiracy—arose in the Southern States and several of the other States, and practically administered the law of the land. The Federal authorities were unable to afford any protection to the classes who are represented by the landlords in Ireland. I do not mean that the negroes of the Southern States are anything like the landlords of Ireland; because they, the negroes, are a hard-working lot of men, do all the work of the country, and were unable to obtain protection, as were also the Whites who belong to the Republican Party. The Government tried their very best to keep order in the country—they suspended the Constitution for several years; but until they gave back their Constitution to the Southern States they were not able to restore law and order, and to put an end to the Ku Klux. This was the case with Ireland. No statesman, until the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, had been wise enough to see that law and order could not be maintained in Ireland without coercion, except by the Representatives of her own people. The right hon. Gentleman introduced his Bill, and it was defeated in this House, and afterwards defeated in the country, and the present Government are now left to face the problem of maintaining law in Ireland. They say that they are going to do it without coercion—I do not believe they will do any such thing. I think it will be necessary for the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to urge their fires, to sharpen their pincers, and prepare their scorpion whips. They will find that the Irish people will never submit to be governed by a Government which is not their own. They will be patient, I have no doubt—they will have abundance of patience. But the incitements which have been addressed to the Irish landlords to evict their judicial tenants, the tenants under the protection of judicial leases, by wholesale, for the non-payment of an impossible rent, will bear fruit. Evictions will take place, and exasperation will follow; and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant will find that it will be impossible for him to collect rents which do not exist, and the landlords will cry out to him for coercion, and will force him to bring forward a measure of coercion. It is not a very pleasant prospect to look forward to—it is not a very pleasant prospect for us. I had hoped and had believed that this question between the two countries might have been settled peacefully with the consent and in the interests of both. That is not to be, at all events for the present. I shudder to think that the state of Ireland may not be so good in three or four months as it is now. Undoubtedly, the distraction of the attention of the people of England to a policy of coercion in Ireland will damage the national prospects and the prospects of Irish autonomy completely. I would do much—I would willingly do anything—to avoid coercion; but things have gone against us, and we are powerless. We see what is coming, and we believe that it will be coercion, and that very soon it will be coercion which will not stop at criminals, which will not be content with taking, or seeking to take, the breakers of the law, but it will be coercion directed against your political opponents in Ireland. It will be directed against the expression of their opinions, publicly or privately, in Ireland, against freedom of speech in the country, against the right of public meeting, against the freedom of the Press. No English Minister hitherto who has administered a Coercion Law has discriminated between political opponents and criminal opponents—he has bundled them together into one; he has shut his eyes and struck at whoever came in his way. That has been our experience in the past, and we do not suppose that the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary are better or more discriminating—however less discriminating—now than their Predecessors have been. We should have wished that some peace would be given—that there should be some truce in this agrarian war. We had hoped that the Government would say, as Lord Carnarvon said this time last year, that he hoped the landlords would exercise their rights with leniency, and give time to the tenants to pay the rents, which they have not. But we have heard nothing of the kind. We have not now a Government which is dependent upon the Irish vote. We have now a Government with which they think they can sail along for a while without us. I do not wish to prophesy, but from my study of the history of the past few years I believe that no system of coercion will be effectual in Ireland. Even though England should accompany it with the suspension of the Constitution, of the rights of Ireland both in this House and out of it, you will not succeed. You must administer your Coercion Bills as Russia does. Then that will be coercion worthy of the name; but to keep up a pretended Constitutional system in Ireland, and to allow 85 Irish Members to come into this House and expose the working of your coercion, that will not be a successful system. You will find that out sooner or later. You may put down liberty of speech in Ireland; you may put down the right of public meeting; and having imprisoned as many of your political opponents without trial as you can lay your hands upon, you will have to come over here and carry the war into the House of Commons, and terminate the sham Constitutional system of representation which you offered to Ireland at the Union. And now Ireland has turned it into a reality, and used it for her own good, you will find it to be intolerable. If I were to offer a suggestion—and I suppose I ought to offer a suggestion—as to what should be done in Ireland now, I would venture to say this. The judicial tenancies were fixed for 15 years. At the time they were fixed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was in doubt as to whether the period should be 15 years, or a shorter period of five years. We declined to take any responsibility upon ourselves with reference to the matter, and the term was fixed for 15 years. In the Scotch Act it was fixed at seven years. I would take even a shorter period, and would fix the period for a revision of the rents at three years according to the prices, and I would admit the leaseholders to the benefit of the Land Act, a proposition which has been named by a Member on each side of the House, the Members for North Armagh and South Tyrone respectively. I would make the term shorter. I would make it three years, and decide what reduction should be given according to the fall of prices. In the case of judicial rents, it could be fixed by a man in an office at Dublin, and without the necessity of sending all over the country. I do not advance this as a settlement of the Irish Land Question; but I advance it as a very pressing necessity for the present winter, and I think if you adopted these two suggestions, and gave some such powers to a Court as are given under the Land Act, to discriminate as to evictions, where the tenant lodges two-thirds of the money into Court, you would relieve the pressure very materially. These are my suggestions, and I offer them humbly with a sincere desire to benefit Ireland; and I should hope that if they or any of them are adopted they would be accompanied by some announcement on the part of the Government similar to that made by Lord Carnarvon this time last year, that they hoped the landlords would remember that they have their duties as well as their rights. This is a time of very serious and sore pressure—a time upon which very much may turn. It surely cannot be the desire of the Government to enter into a deliberate conflict with the tenantry of Ireland, to exterminate them by many thousands. ["Oh, oh!"] I do not see any other result if they proceed on the lines of the declarations we have heard from the responsible officials of the Government. However it may be, I am confident that whether the Government go on in the course which they have chosen, and whether they recognize the pressure which is upon the agricultural community in Ireland, the National Question, the question of autonomy for Ireland, now that it has been raised, will be always first in the hearts of the Irish people. The large Liberal majority—the vast majority of the Liberal Party, who have voted for the solution at the General Election, will vote for it again, and their ranks will then be replenished by those doubters whose hesitancy lost the battle on this occasion, and whose conversion will gain it for us at the next. I beg to move as an Amendment to the Address the words which stand in my name.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words,—"And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I am exceedingly reluctant to stand, even for a short time, between the House and the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone); but as the speech which has been delivered, if it was spoken in support of any case, was spoken in support of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, I am sure he will not think I am exceeding the limits of courtesy if, for a short time, I intervene in the debate. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Parnell), in the very remarkable speech he delivered, commenced by demurring to the inference which he said was drawn from recent events, that the question of Home Rule was disposed of. He said that if there were a General Election now to take place a very different result would follow. Well, I am bound to say that I cannot trace any signs of the times, so far, at all events, that go to support that supposition. What I know is that within the walls of this House we had last night a very signal instance of the accord which subsists between hon. Members on both sides of this House who are linked together for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the Union of the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland; and outside this House, at every election that has hitherto taken place, at every opportunity there has been of testing public opinion, the majorities obtained by candidates supporting the Government have, in every instance, been increased. The hon. Gentleman went on to say something about General Sir Redvers Buller, on which I cannot enter. For, as the hon. Member is very well aware, he having moved an Amendment to the Address, every speaker who follows him must confine himself to the terms of that Amendment. However, I suppose it is not outside the limits of that Rule to refer to the question which he has put to the Government. He has asked us how soon we are going to inform the House of the composition of the Commission which is to be issued? Surely this is a novel course for the hon. Member to adopt! after having, by his supporters in this House, for the last three nights, by every means in his power, thrown ridicule and discredit on the proposal to issue that Commission, having himself, in his own speech, done all he can to damage whatever beneficial effects it might have, he seems to make it a grievance—or a request—that he and his Friends should take part in the proceedings of that Commission. It is really a very difficult thing to follow the particular line of argument which the hon. Member has adopted this evening.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): I did not ask that I and my Friends should take part in the Commission. I referred to a statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I asked whether he was going to carry out that statement?

MR. PLUNKET: The House will agree with me that it comes to very much the same thing; but the hon. Member is very anxious to get a grievance against the Government in any way he can. He next went on to deal with the question of Land Purchase, and I think the line he adopted on that branch of the subject was as audacious as almost anything else he said in his daring speech. It was evident he was extremely anxious to wash his hands of any complicity in the Act of 1885, known as Lord Ashbourne's Act; and for that purpose he raked up a number of personal charges against Members of the present Government, which have over and over again, in each case, been most absolutely and categorically denied. The hon. Member will not listen this evening to any proposed extension of the operation of the Land Purchase Act, because he says you cannot depend on anything in the nature of local guarantee. He says, and with great truth, that his estimate of the cost of carrying out the system of Land Purchase in Ireland was £100,000,000. On the same occasion the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian estimated that the operation would cost £300,000,000.

MR. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): What year was this?

MR. PLUNKET: I am going to read it. I say the right hon. Gentleman estimated, at the time I am referring to, that if the proposal then made were carried out it would require £300,000,000, and this was at the time the hon. Member for the City of Cork estimated it at £100,000,000. It was on the 12th of June, 1883, when my noble Friend the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton) brought forward a Resolution; and it was in the debate on that Resolution that the right hon. Gentleman spoke as follows:—

> "I may state, however, that the proposal would involve the question of a State guarantee to the extent of several hundreds of millions—£300,000,000 or £400,000,000."—(3 *Hansard*, [280] 451.)

The hon. Member for Cork immediately said "£100,000,000;" and in his own speech, on the same occasion, the hon. Member alluded to the subject, and said that he was greatly in favour of single ownership; that he was opposed to dual ownership; and that the only chance for the salvation of Ireland lay in every occupier being his own landlord.

MR. PARNELL: I am in favour of it still.

MR. PLUNKET: Very well, I am glad to hear it; but I venture to say the hon. Member left an impression on the House that he was opposed to it. He then said he was "speaking for himself," as this evening he told us he was speaking for himself, when he argued just now that—

> "Nothing could be more untrustworthy than a local guarantee, and he was always of that opinion."

MR. PARNELL: In congested districts.

MR. PLUNKET: But in 1883 the hon. Gentleman said—

> "As far as regarded the advance of money on the security of the local rates, the interposition of the Local Authority, and the advance of the whole of the purchase money, he saw no objection to the former, and he approved of the latter."

The Local Authority was good enough as security for the advance of the whole of the purchase money in 1883; but to-night the Local Authority is not at all reliable for less than the whole.

MR. PARNELL: In congested districts. My references were entirely confined exclusively to them.

MR. PLUNKET: When the hon. Member takes such pains to wash his hands of all responsibility for the Act of 1885 I would venture to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian and to the House that it may make people a little cautious of the kind of undertakings which the hon. Member has lately given in support of the twin proposals of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister. In the next place, the hon. Member for Cork proceeded to deal with judicial rents. He assigned, as I understood, three reasons why judicial rents are too highly assessed. The first was that the House of Lords mutilated the Land Act of 1881; the second was that the judgment in the famous case of "Adams *v.* Dunseath" gave an unjust preference to the landlords; and the third was that the Land Commissioners had allowed themselves to be browbeaten. I should like—as the House contains a good many new Members—that they should know the views held by the late Government on this question of judicial rents, and also particularly as to the case of "Adams *v.* Dunseath." There was a Bill brought forward by the Member for Cork in 1883, and it was opposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian in a very eloquent and powerful speech. It was also opposed by the then Solicitor General, afterwards Lord Herschell, and Lord Chancellor in the last Administration. Lord Herschell said the judgment in "Adams *v.* Dunseath" was perfectly correct, and he maintained that the provision in Clause 5 of the Bill was opposed to the decision in that case. They must, Lord Herschell said, take his scheme as a whole, and taking it in that way it came to nothing but this—that everything beyond prairie value would be deemed to be the property of the tenant. Therefore, I think the House will be slow to adopt the view of the hon. Member for Cork as to the unfairness of judicial rents against the authority of the great legal personage whom I have cited. The hon. Member alleges that these judicial rents have been unfairly fixed; and he says that owing to the fall in prices the greatest difficulty will be experienced in paying the present rents. No doubt there has been a certain fall in prices, although the estimates of that fall have been greatly exaggerated by the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends. What I want to put before the House is this—that it was the duty of the Sub-Commissioners, and I know it was their practice, to take into account, when fixing these judicial rents, the probability of a fall in prices. They fixed these rents in a falling market. ["Oh, oh!"] If it were at all necessary I would quote one or two instances of that kind. I will give one case. Mr. Commissioner Riordan, in December, 1881, dealing with a certain case, said that the rents had not been altered for a century, and the tenants and landlords were on the best of terms. The tenant right also had been valued at a high price on the estates. All these facts, he said, seemed to show that the rent was a fair one. Still, as the landlord had once given a reduction on a bad year, the Commissioners decided to reduce the rent, and Mr. Riordan added—

> "In my opinion, a fair rent should be such a rent as the tenant could pay through good years and bad."

In the next place, the hon. Member goes on to say that there will be numerous evictions, causing widespread suffering. First, as to the probability of this great number of evictions taking place. I think the House will be glad to hear that, so far from an increase in evictions lately, within the last 18 months the tendency has been to decrease; and, furthermore, as to that month of next November which is held up as so formidable in this matter of evictions, they are usually fewer then than in any other month of the year. The fact of the matter is, that you cannot obtain your decree until January at earliest. The evictions for the year 1885 were 3,127 tenancies. In 1,540 of these cases there was no actual disturbance of the tenants at all, and I am informed that it was officially calculated for the late Government that on an average it is in one only out of every five cases that the tenants are actually dispossessed, the rest being restored to their tenancies on their redeeming, or by arrangement with the landlords. Therefore only 600 are actually evicted, while 2,500 would be restored to their tenancies. I think that is a very important fact, which the House should be in possession of when they hear of these large number of evictions.

Mr. PARNELL: Where do you get that information from?

Mr. PLUNKET: I am informed that this information was obtained for the late Government within the last year. Furthermore it was stated the other night by the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) that there were means provided under the Land Act of 1881 by which tenants whom it was sought to evict could obtain, on showing proper cause, a stay of proceedings from the County Court. That is absolutely the fact; but, says the right hon. Gentleman, how are these poor people, who are very squalid and miserable, to take advantage of it? As a matter of fact, they do take advantage of it, as they took advantage of a more complicated Act—the Arrears Act—an Act specially passed to meet the case of these very poor people. As to the third part of the Amendment, the hon. Member has himself treated it in a very perfunctory manner, and I think I have already disposed of the matter by quotations from his previous speeches. The object of the Government is to carry further—and we believe successfully to carry further—the policy of the Act known as Lord Ashbourne's Act, and I am sure the House will be happy to hear that the number of persons applying to purchase their tenancies under that Act is steadily and rapidly increasing. Of course, that depends on one consideration. The possibility of the complete success of that Act, and of the other proposals of the Government for the improvement of the material condition of Ireland, must depend upon the success of their endeavours to preserve social order. So far as the Government is concerned, no one, I think, can accuse them of having taken any action or adopted any policy—hitherto at all events—whatever else you may criticize in our policy, that was not conceived in a spirit of conciliation. The hon. Member for the City of Cork drew a contrast—as he is very fond of doing—between the present Ministers and Lord Carnarvon, who was late Chief Governor of Ireland. He said that Lord Carnarvon had appealed to the Irish landlords to exercise their rights with mercy as well as justice, and he said—"Why did you not do so?" I think if the hon. Member had read, if he did not hear, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) last night, he would not have made that remark. My right hon. Friend made as fair and as effective an appeal of that kind as it was possible to make. But when the hon. Member accuses us—as he seemed to accuse us—of a desire to draw the people of Ireland into a resistance to the law by the policy which we propose and the words which we use, what shall we say of the words that he himself has just now used, in, I must say, his most cold-blooded manner, on this subject? He used that language to this House, to the Irish people, and to the world; that our policy of conciliation must fail, and he prophesied that we shall be driven to have recourse to stringent coercion in Ireland. Sir, it is only possible for Her Majesty's Government to endeavour to adopt a policy conciliatory to the Irish people; and I say in the presence of this House that the responsibility which the hon. Member for Cork has taken upon himself to-night is a responsibility awful and terrible in my mind.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): When I had the honour of addressing the House on Thursday evening last, at no great length, I confined myself to the matter of the Speech delivered from the Throne, which I conceived would be in conformity with usage; but entirely new matter has been submitted to us by Her Majesty's Government on the present occasion. I, therefore, did not enter into any of the important questions which were opened after I sat down by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Do not let it be supposed that I am making it a subject of complaint; but the course which has been taken has been a very unusual one. I do not think that I can recollect, in the long course of years of the last half-century and more, a single occasion when the Government has thought it politic to use the Address to the Throne as the opportunity for explaining its policy beyond the compass of the Speech from the Throne. The present Government will, no doubt, have considered their own convenience and advantage—that is to say, the advantage to their policy—as they were entitled to consider. I am making no complaint of what they have done. I think that they will gain no undue advantage from it. One of the best-established maxims of all Parties and all legislators I have known in this country has been to keep back all statements of your principal intentions of policy, the principal enactments of the Bills you intended to introduce, until you could present them in the Parliamentary form in which you meant to give them. The present Government has given us, however, the main outlines of its policy on the occasion of the Speech from the Throne. Of course, I do not make it a matter of complaint on our side. They have done what I suspect, if it became a general practice, will be far from conducing to the interests and cause of legislation. Yet, although I make it no matter of complaint, it requires some comment upon the announcements which have been made. Part of that comment comes in the form of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), which forms the immediate alternative to the adoption of the Speech. It is not my intention to take any part in the division on that Amendment, should a division be pressed. I can perfectly understand why, with the knowledge which the hon. Member possesses, and with the responsibilities which he feels as an Irish Member, he should find himself entitled and bound to make declarations respecting the difficulty of the payment of rent in Ireland and respecting the probability of evictions, in which it would hardly be warrantable on my part to join, though, on the other hand, it is not in my power to assert the contrary of what has been stated by the hon. Gentleman. The reason why I do not wish to enter into a proceeding of that kind is this—that I think, upon the whole, it is for the advantage of the country that no attempt should be made by the House at large, as distinguished from the Representatives of Ireland, and those who may think fit to act with them—that no attempt should be made to procure a precipitate or hasty decision by the House upon the policy propounded by Her Majesty's Government. It would not be fair to the Government; it would not be fair to the House. We have no sufficient opportunity of understanding all the details and particulars of that policy, though much has been told us; and I do not think that the interests of the country would be promoted by endeavouring, on the occasion of the Speech from the Throne, to obtain a definitive judgment from the House. Well, Sir, but that is no reason, I think, why there should not be free comment upon the policy which has been declared to us. That free comment has, indeed, been offered by Gentlemen on both sides of the House, and by Gentlemen on this side of the House not altogether accordant in their views. The first observation I make is, that this policy has been presented to us in forms materially different. The Chancellor of the Exchequer presented it in the form which he thought proper on the night when the Address was moved. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland again presented it last night in what we conceived to be a reduced and modified form. On the other hand, in "another place," with not less authority, the form of that policy was presented larger than either; and there is some difficulty in determining which of these three forms is the most authentic and the most to be relied upon. If that largest form had been definitely withdrawn, I do not hesitate to say that it would be a matter to me of comfort and satisfaction. But it has not been stated that it has been withdrawn. Probably it may be admitted that there is the difference which I think will be seen in the statements of the three Ministers to whom I have referred. The leading points in this policy I think are five. In the first place, the issue of the Commissions; in the second place, the introduction of the subject of public works; in the third place, the subject of land purchase; in the fourth place, inquiry into land rents; and, in the fifth place, the reference to local government. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary drew a contrast between this policy and the policy of the late Government, and said that, whatever else this policy might be, he considered it a sober policy. Sir, I am not able to give to it that particular epithet. I will say that the light in which it presents itself to me is that of an eminently complex and an eminently difficult policy. In speaking of the policy of the late Government during the Elections I ventured to say that it presented an extremely simple issue. I did not mean that the measures necessary for carrying it into effect were simple measures; they were, on the contrary, of a very complex character. But the issue presented to the country was, notwithstanding, a very simple issue. It was whether you would, or whether you would not, give a Statutory Parliament to Ireland?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I rise to a point of Order, Sir. I am very sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman; but I am obliged to direct the attention of the Chair to the terms of the Address, and to ask whether it is competent, under the terms of the Amendment, for hon. Members following the speech of the hon. Member for Cork to travel to any extent wide of the definite terms of that Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been that when the general debate on the Address appears to have terminated by the introduction of an Amendment, then the general discussion on the Address is closed; and when an Amendment is proposed the discussion is confined to the subject-matter of that Amendment. Of course, when the hon. Member for Cork introduces his Amendment he refers, before proposing the Amendment, to a variety of subjects; but he concludes with an Amendment. Having concluded with an Amendment, it is a specific Amendment before the House, and the general question of relevancy applies. It would be out of Order, for instance, in my opinion, to refer to the question of Burmah on the specific Amendment. Though the subject of land will be in some degree pertinent to the Amendment, it would be more strictly in Order if the debate were henceforth more strictly confined to the specific terms of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I think myself rather hardly used. It has been the invariable practice for a great many years in this House that the Leader of the Opposition should speak on the Speech from the Throne; and the very fact that that has been the invariable practice shows that the debate is confined to the matter of the Speech till Amendments begin. Now, Sir, for the first time for half-a-century large plans of policy are introduced after I had addressed the House, not by Amendments, but by Her Majesty's Government; and, therefore, Sir, I make my petition to the House. If the House think sit right that in consequence of my conforming to the practice and maintaining in my own person a practice which is convenient to the House, but beyond all things for the convenience of the Government, I should be excluded from making any remarks on the policy which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced after the speech I made—if, Sir, that be the judgment of the House, if it be your judgment, I am perfectly content to give way at once. But I have known many instances—[*Loud Ministerial cries of* "Order!"]. If I am forbidden to speak upon the policy which, contrary to usage, the noble Lord on the part of the Government introduced in a manner unknown before—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I really think I must, for the convenience of the House, state this much. Though I do adhere to the ruling I have given, that after an Amendment has been proposed discussion should be relevant to that Amendment, I must remind the right hon. Gentleman that when the Amendment is concluded the Address again open to amendment in the interval between that Amendment and possibly a subsequent Amendment. But when an Amendment is before the House I am only interpreting the Rules by saying that the discussion must be generally relevant to the subject-matter of the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I rise, Sir, to ask a question on the point of Order. I need not point out to you that my right hon. Friend could not speak at the stage to which you refer, because he had already spoken on the Address when it was generally before the House. I wish to ask you whether, if it be necessary, in consequence of the objection taken by the noble Lord to my right hon. Friend being allowed an opportunity of discussing the policy of the Government, that another Amendment should be moved, it would not be possible — though, unfortunately, it would protract the Sittings of the House —at a later stage, if such an Amendment be moved, for my right hon. Friend to make a statement on the subject of the Government policy?

MR. SPEAKER: I have laid down my ruling perfectly indifferent to the convenience of any hon. or right hon. Gentleman. Of course, it would be competent for an Amendment to be subsequently moved if the right hon. Gentleman desires to go into the subject-matter of the policy of the Government.

Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE: I hope, Sir, that no person will suppose that I questioned one syllable that has fallen from you; but I have frequently known occasions in this House when, in consequence of peculiar circumstances in a debate, indulgence has been extended by the House. My application is for that indulgence. ["Order!"] I have no intention of detaining the House at great length. If there is a disposition to grudge that indulgence I will not press the suit; but if it is granted I will venture to make a few remarks.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I should be most anxious myself to grant any indulgence necessary to the right hon. Gentleman; but I would desire to remove what appears to me to be a misapprehension. What I have doubts about and am most anxious about is the prolongation of the debate which is likely to occur if all hon. Members were to recur to other matters.

Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE: I shall endeavour to use with very great moderation that indulgence for which I have asked, and for the occasion of which I do not hold myself responsible, since my object in rising on Thursday night was to conform to a practice eminently convenient to the Business of the House, and most convenient to the Government of the day. I was in the act of saying that when we proposed to give a Statutory Parliament to Ireland, our meaning was that we should at length let Ireland transact her own affairs upon her own responsibility, and should relieve ourselves of the management of her internal affairs. Well, to that plan, I think, there was one incidental exception, with respect to the purchase of land, upon which I will not now dwell; but what I wish to point out is that the policy now announced is the absolute inversion of that policy. I am not making it a matter of blame; but it seems to me a necessary consequence of the footing upon which the Government have taken Office that Ireland is not to transact her own affairs, but that England is to assume a number of responsibilities, heavy beyond anything, involving the most complicated discussion, and, in my opinion, rendering progress of the most essential and difficult and important Business of Great Britain impossible. I say that because I see what has now happened in the outline that I have drawn of the proposals of the present Government. Here are three great subjects—namely, first of all, the appointment of Commissions; secondly, the scheme of inquiry with respect to public works; and, thirdly, the subject of land rents, which are complete additions to what we had before the House. Well, with regard to these Commissions, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland thinks he has been reproached—he may have been reproached, I do not know it—with having advised these Commissions as a means for protracting his tenure of Office. He protested, and I think very properly, against the putting of any such construction upon the appointment of the Commissions, and when it was intimated that he himself had given in to that practice he said emphatically "Never." I beg to refresh the memory of the right hon. Gentleman. In the month of May or the beginning of June we stated that it was our intention, should the Bill for the better government of Ireland receive the sanction of the House on the second reading, that as we could not finish that Bill and likewise the Land Question within the ordinary period of the Session, we intended to ask the House to adjourn further progress with it until the beginning of October, and the right hon. Gentleman said—"Oh, see what this means; this is, in point of fact, to be a Continuance in Office Bill." Now I quote this in no invidious or polemical sense; but I heartily rejoice that the preaching of the right hon. Gentleman is better than his practice. Moreover, I am convinced it is his preaching, and not the mere accidental reference to which I have now alluded, that exhibits the true state of his mind. These charges of advising inquiries for the sake of continuance in Office are not worthy of the House, and not worthy of political Parties in this country. Sir, I make no such charge; but I must not be precluded from observing that the appointment of these Commissions, and especially of the Commission with respect to land, does introduce most serious delay into the progress of this House with the Public Business, and especially with the Irish Business of this country. What is laid out before us is that probably in the end of the Spring the Commission may report. We are now in the month of August; in the end of the spring the Commission may report upon the subject of rents. I think anyone can see that it is no exaggeration to state that if the Commission is to inquire into rents and report upon rents in the end of the spring, and if the Government is then, to use the phrase of the noble Lord, to give "immense consideration" to what the Commission may report, the chances of legislation upon this subject, immediately and closely connected with social order, even during the next year, are very slight indeed. With respect to public works I will not say more than a word, because I think that what has been stated by my right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) last night, and stated tonight by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), in his powerful speech, shows but too well upon how dangerous a course the House is invited to embark. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) said £750,000 is not a very alarming sum. No, Sir, it is not a very alarming sum, if I am to consider it as an amount of money; but there are two modes of dealing with these pecuniary questions. The first is for the Gentleman who makes the proposal to state some initial expenditure that is afterwards to receive some indefinite expansion, and the other is to state at the very outset the outside of the whole expenditure to which you think the principle of your proposal, if fully adopted, can by possibility lead. Sir, it was for taking that course with regard to our Land Purchase Bill that both the Bill itself and the sister Bill with respect to the Government of Ireland suffered so heavily at the hands of Parliament. I know very well that you are liable to suffer heavily for taking such a course. You may frighten, you may alarm and shake the nerve, so to speak, of Parliament for the moment; but, at the same time, I think it is a better course than that which has happened in the case of almost all the greatest and most costly works of fortification that we have attempted during my Parliamentary life, when a few hundreds of thousands of pounds are first submitted to Parliament as the ascertained expense, and then in course of time from year to year those hundreds of thousands are expanded into millions. What is the object of the right hon. Gentleman in this plan? It is not merely to execute works useful in themselves; but he very fairly stated that his object was to find employment for a large portion of the people of Ireland who cannot obtain an adequate subsistence from the holdings that they occupy. But is an outlay of £750,000 to attain that great national object? On the contrary——

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Nothing of the kind.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, I will endeavour to explain what I did say to the best of my recollection. I referred to the foundation, so to speak, of the deep sea fishing industry on the West Coast of Ireland as affording employment and means of subsistence to the practically almost starving population of the West Coast; and I referred to the expenditure of £750,000, not as affording employment, but as carrying out that system of drainage in Ireland of which, indeed, the smaller parts are already carried out, but which it is necessary to complete by arterial works.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE: I perfectly understood that; but the right hon. Gentleman referred to the defective employment of a large portion of the people of Ireland who cannot properly subsist upon their holdings, and the advantage of finding labour for that portion of the population. That, in my opinion, is a work in itself most difficult for this Parliament, and, through the administration known as the Dublin Castle administration, perfectly hopeless. But I will not dwell upon that subject or enter into its details. I wish to say one word upon the subject of Land Purchase. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), last night, in referring to the Land Purchase Bill, stated, I think, that he considered the security upon which the advances under that Bill had been made was a very deficient and bad security. I am not going now to defend it; but that security was the entire Revenue of Ireland, as well as the entire land rents of Ireland. That security is deemed an insufficient security. Well, Sir, I hope that those critics who showed such patriotic vigour in dealing with the security proposed under our Bill will be no less patriotic and rigid in considering the security under the Government proposals. We are now promised a large extension, if I understand it, of Lord Ashbourne's Bill, and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork is deemed to be very inconsistent because he did not entirely condemn the guarantee of Local Authorities under Lord Ashbourne's Bill and at the same time objects to that guarantee under the present circumstances of the case. But, Sir, I must observe this—that the guarantee of Local Authorities may be tolerable at any rate in the very limited transactions where in any one county in Ireland it was most improbable that more than a very few hundred thousand pounds could be laid out. But that is not the state of facts now before us. The object of the Government apparently is to have a large scheme of Land Purchase; and, Sir, I must confess I cannot express too strongly my opinion that the guarantee of Local Authorities for a plan of that kind, whatever be the intention of the Government in proposing it, would, if adopted, prove the veriest delusion to the country, and would be totally ineffective for the purpose of securing the advances that might be made from the Treasury. No doubt, this is a very large scheme. This is not a question of £5,000,000 or of £10,000,000; it is a question of converting dual ownership into single ownership—that is as far at least as our plan went. Our plan excluded from operation all rents held by landlords, all demesnes, all residences, and made other important deductions from the total of the land of Ireland. I will not pronounce any opinion on this matter at present further than that to the point of security for advances the closest and most vigilant attention of the House must be directed, and also to the extension of the system of creditorship and debtorship between the Exchequer of this country and the individual occupier of the land of Ireland. The first of these points demands the most jealous inspection; and, as regards the second, considering the broad objections to be taken, on the ground partly of economical and still more of political danger, Her Majesty's Government will find that they have undertaken no holiday task. But much more formidable than the question of Land Purchase is the question of Land Rents. The right hon. Gentleman thinks that the sober plan of appointing a Commission to examine into the whole of the land rents of Ireland, or the judicial rents—I am not quite sure whether we are to understand that the inquiry will be confined to the judicial rents—[Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: To the judicial rents.] Well, Sir, the subject-matter may in that way be limited, but the difficulties of principle are increased. Here the doctrine has been laid down, and we ought to know from Her Majesty's Government without delay whether that doctrine is to be maintained or not, that in cases where judicial rents are extravagant, where the real rent which the land will bear is below the judicial rent, the tenant is to be charged on the basis of the real rentable value, that the landlord is to be paid on the basis of the judicial rent, and the difference is to be found elsewhere. That statement has been made, and made by adequate authority, on the part of Her Majesty's Government. It is not an unfair or an extreme proposition to ask Her Majesty's Government whether such an intention is or is not entertained. Whether they may carry it into law or not I will not ask, for no power on earth, no power within these walls or beyond them, will succeed in carrying into law such a proposition. I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord opposite have made no reference to this subject. They seem to be what is called "shy of it." While those more immediately interested in the question of the money are no doubt entitled to attach the greatest importance to such a declaration, on the other hand, the taxpayers of this country are entitled to and must attach the greatest importance to it; and not only the taxpayers of this country, but all the debtors in this country, all men who find that their incomes are in an uncertain condition, and that the obligation which others have undertaken towards them cannot, under the existing circumstances, always be fulfilled. In principle such a plan is, in my opinion, totally inadmissible. It establishes a distinction between judicial rents and other rents in respect to the title of the landlord which we have never admitted and never can admit. The title of the landlord receiving rent, in the one case, is just as good and sacred in every point as it is in the other. Even if the plan of the Government could be adopted, I do not believe that any power on earth could confine it to judicial rents. You would find the claim of the receiver of non-judicial rents in Ireland perfectly irresistible after the claim of the holder of judicial rents had been admitted to receive compensation from the State. Then I come to the question of this appointment of a Commission upon rents considered in relation to the question of social order. We did not touch the question of rents in our policy at all. We endeavoured to give Ireland the management of her own affairs, and give the Irish landlord the power of transferring his estate to the Irish authority upon fair market terms. Here I must say a word upon what fell from my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale last night. When he spoke of this proposition that the State should pay the difference between the judicial rent and the rent that the land would bear, he said that there was something of that principle in the Land Purchase Bill. Well, my noble Friend did not give us his opinion upon the proposition that the State should bear the charge, and I am sorry that he did not do so. But I most emphatically say, as one connected with the Land Purchase Bill, that there was not one shred or tittle in that Bill of the principle that the State should pay an unreal value. The principle in that Bill was that we were to discover as well as we could the real, fair, equitable, market value of the property and purchase it on the basis of that value. You will say that we offered 20 years' purchase. We took 20 years as the best result we could arrive at; but it was merely the expression of our opinion upon a very difficult and complex question; and the House of Commons, most certainly, if that Bill had proceeded, would not have taken 20 years upon our credit and authority. It might have been shown that the period was too long or that it was too short. I do not enter into that question now. I must say that it appears to me that nothing could have been more unfortunate than the relation of this Commission upon rent to the social circumstances of Ireland. The Commission is to report late next spring. It has been shown by the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Plunket) who has just sat down—and no doubt he is accurate—that no decree can be obtained for the November rent before January at the soonest, and that a further time must elapse before evictions for those rents can actually take place. That may be so; but I do not think that the institution of a multitude of processes of evictions, perfectly well known to the people, next winter, and even before the decrees, can have a very favourable effect on the social order of the country. Even on the showing of the right hon. and learned Gentleman himself these evictions will take place before the Report of the Commission, and, *a fortiori*, before it is possible that there can be any legislation upon it. Therefore, we are in this position, that we are saying to the tenant—"You must pay your rent in November on pain of eviction;" and, at the same time, we are insinuating—and more than insinuating, we are carrying with considerable authority into his mind—the belief that his rent is an unjust rent by appointing a Commission to inquire whether it is unjust or not. No one can doubt that the mere fact of appointing such a Commission tends to favour evictions in November; much more does the most unfortunate declaration of the noble Lord tend in that direction. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary did all he could to soften that declaration in his speech, of the tone of which no one has any title or disposition to complain. But the noble Lord did undoubtedly and emphatically assert the title of the landlord to the full assistance of the law in the exaction of his full rights, and did not accompany that statement with any appeal to the landlords for a clement and moderate exercise of those powers. He must have had the circumstances of Lord Carnarvon's appeal some months ago in his mind; but passing by that appeal altogether he makes this declaration as to the landlord's title. Who doubted the landlord's title? If the landlord's title is the subject of no doubt why was that declaration made; and how, again, can it be construed in Ireland except as an encouragement to the landlords towards the prompt and extensive exercise of the right and the power of eviction upon the non-payment of rent? It is an encouragement to evictions, and something else besides. It is not only an encouragement to eviction, but it is a great discouragement to remissions. What landlord having a judicial rent can be expected to make remissions, however great the pressure of the times, in the face of the inquiries of this Commission? By making remissions does not he admit that his rent is too high, does he not prejudice his case before the Commission? Why, Sir, I do not require to travel far for an authority. The right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down supplied me with the authority. If he were to repeat the words that he quoted from Sub-Commissioner Reardon under the Land Act, they would express the very feeling that I describe. The landlord referred to refused to make a remission of his rent, because, he said, it would prejudice his case before the Court. Well, if it would prejudice the case of the landlord before the Court where a tenant claimed a reduction, exactly on the same principle if a number of humane and considerate landlords reduced their judicial rents in face of the inquiry before the Commission, how do you escape the consequence that those judicial rents will be likely to be prejudiced by the act of the landlord himself, and that they will be taken to be too high for the tenants to pay? There is one other point on which I must say a word. The Government have intimated to us their intention to introduce a measure for the establishment or extension of local government in Ireland. As far as I apprehend the case, that announcement on their part is not accompanied with a repetition of a declaration made in January by the right hon. Gentleman the present Chief Secretary for Ireland—namely, that the then Government would propose no measure for the establishment of popular local institutions in Ireland of a nature that could possibly be used as a leverage for obtaining further change. I hope I may infer that, as that ominous declaration has not been repeated, it has been dropped. Undoubtedly he will be a very ingenious man who would introduce popular institutions of any kind in any part of Ireland, and at the same time take effectual security that they should not be used as a leverage for further change. I am glad, so far, to observe that this announcement is apparently liberated from that serious encumbrance; but I do not believe that the announcement can or will be satisfactory while it is coupled, as it is coupled by the noble Lord, with the necessity of conforming to what England and Scotland may now think necessary for their own local institutions. I will not enter in detail into these questions, but I will say that such a limitation is most unjust to Ireland and hardly less unjust to Scotland. Scotland has given no thought to this great subject of extended local government. The mind of Scotland has not ripened upon that question. It would be a very unfortunate state of things if you take the measure of Scotland's desires before those desires have been matured, and when, in fact, they have scarcely ever found vent at all, and say that you will grant to Ireland nothing beyond the limit of those desires. There was an important point referred to by my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale last night upon which I would say a word. My noble Friend spoke of local government, and said he reserved his judgment. But what I want to know is, does my noble Friend adhere—I feel convinced that he does—to the principles he himself declared on the subject? My noble Friend's progress in this matter has been slow, but I think it has been sure in one and the same direction, and during the Elections my noble Friend in one of his speeches declared certain principles upon which he was ready to grant local government—a considerable measure of self-government—to Ireland. It was the more emphatic because my noble Friend himself gave emphasis to the change, or at least to the expansion, of his opinion. He said that the change of circumstances had convinced him that much must be done in this direction. My noble Friend laid down four conditions of great importance on both sides. The first was that the Imperial Parliament was to continue to represent the whole of the United Kingdom, and that the Irish Members were to retain their seats in this House. The second was that powers were to be given to the Irish Legislature by delegation and not by surrender. I do not believe that any Gentleman below the Gangway would make the smallest difficulty on that subject, for I do not believe it is possible for the wit of man to devise any legislative measure by which you could do anything but delegate powers or by which you could contrive to surrender them. The third was that the Irish

Legislative Body was only to have control in certain subjects which were to be enumerated—instead of enumerating the exceptions—he laid great stress on that—and they were still to be subject to a right of control or revision within the walls of the two Houses of Parliament—a provision undoubtedly of very great importance as a limitation, it may be said, perhaps, a mutilation; at any rate, as an effective limitation and restriction of the plans proposed by the late Government. The fourth was that the administration of justice was to remain under the authority and responsibility of Parliament. I do not know how far my noble Friend is to carry that proposition; whether he wishes to deny to a Body legislating in Ireland, for certain enumerated purposes, the power with respect to the police and justice which is given to every municipality in this country. I do not know, but I take these conditions as they stand. They were conditions perfectly incompatible with the Bill we had the honour to submit to Parliament, and quite impossible to be accepted by the authors of that Bill—conditions that I never could regard as giving any full or final satisfaction to the reasonable wishes or wants of the people of Ireland. Now, let me look from the other side upon these conditions, because there is a matter of great importance to be observed on the other side. They, one and all of them, proceed upon the assumption that there is to be one Central Body governing and legislating in Ireland for certain enumerated purposes. That is the policy to which my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale has advanced; that is the policy which he believes to be necessary, having undergone a process of expansion, in his opinion, in consequence of the change of circumstances which has taken place. Does my noble Friend adhere to that policy? Does he think Ireland is entitled to ask for the institution of such a Central Body? Will Her Majesty's Government entertain that principle? Will they try whether by the adoption of that principle they can establish what is called a *modus vivendi* between themselves and the Irish people? I make this suggestion with no concealment of what my own views are; but, at same time, with this sentiment—that there are those in this House—for example, my noble Friend—who wish to do much for Ireland, though they will not do that which we ask them to do. Surely, after the part which my noble Friend and those around have taken, after the manner in which, by their indefatigable exertions, the late Government suffered defeat in this House and at the polls, he has a good claim on the present Government to extend a little the unnatural and factitious limit which they profess it to be their intention to place on local government in Ireland, and to see whether they cannot at least bring their liberality up to the point—which we must presume to be a very safe one—proposed by my noble Friend. There is another point connected with local government on which I wish to make an appeal. I have been speaking with great regret of the delay which it appears to me will be introduced into Irish and English legislation in consequence of the appointment of more than one Commission on subjects upon which I believe ample information is already in the hands of Parliament. But I am inclined to hope, listening to what has been said, that that delay need not affect the plans with regard to local government in Ireland.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Certainly not.

Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE: Certainly not. At any rate, then we may hope that at the commencement of the next Session of Parliament the Government will be prepared with their plans for local government, and that they will not depend upon any previous inquiry by their Commissions. I gather that from the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, and I receive it with satisfaction.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I do not wish my reply carried further than it was intended to go; what I meant was, that, except in regard to the points named, an inquiry into those two questions upon which Commissions were to be issued would not in any way delay the consideration of the question of local government. How the Government would approach that was stated by my noble Friend, and also by myself.

Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE: I quite accept the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman. I have no right in any way to tie the right hon. Gentleman by his words to any particular course with regard to local government beyond this. I must own, in conformity with what fell from me on Thursday night, I am quite at a loss to understand how the Government should find it necessary, in the month of August, to postpone to February their measure with regard to local government, and we reserve our right to make any comments we may think fit to make upon the course which the Government may take in that respect. I trusted the proposals with regard to local government would not be affected by the delay incidental to the operation of the Commissions so far as that is concerned, and I think the right hon. Gentleman has given me ample satisfaction by a distinct answer. I have not intentionally exaggerated, or said, or done anything either to introduce heat into the debate, or to darken unnecessarily the prospect which is before us; but I own it is not in my opinion other than a very dark prospect. I see in it a very large and great widening of the field of Irish legislation. I see in it an enormous augmentation of the bulk of Irish Business. I see in it, therefore, a very great addition to that which at present, by the magnitude it already offers to us, is the main obstacle to our transaction of the proper and immediate Business in regard to England and Scotland. I see in it, Sir, a delay which is, to my mind, a grave mistake in connection with national questions which have been raised with respect to Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary said last night that he considered that the difficulties of governing Ireland had been much increased in consequence of the propositions that we had made. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to say that in that announcement he was in diametrical contradiction to the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because when I asked that noble Lord—"How is it that, having thought coercion necessary in January last, now, although there has been no diminution but rather a slight increase in crime, you think coercion to be unnecessary?" the noble Lord answered—

> "On account of the enormous change of circumstances; you have become the leaders of the Nationalists in Ireland, and therefore we are entitled to presume that legality will be now the general rule in that country."

If legality is the rule, that is the greatest diminution of the difficulties of government, and is not an increase of them. One thing I must say; hon. Gentlemen seem ready to catch at the imputation that we have become the leaders of the Nationalists in Ireland, as if that were a serious charge against the late Government. For my part I am delighted to have had any share or part whatever in becoming either leader or follower, I care not which, in any movement that tends by soothing the people of Ireland and by encouraging them to hope for the realization of their just claims—I am delighted to think that we shall have had a share, according to the noble Lord, who gives us in his bounty a very large share indeed, if not the whole, in establishing better ideas with regard to legality in Ireland. But this I must say —it is not in our power to answer for the state of Ireland as long as you choose to continue a system under which you have this sad fact staring you in the face, that whereas law in England is administered in an English spirit, and law in Scotland is administered in a Scotch spirit, law in Ireland is not administered in an Irish spirit. With that state of facts staring you in the face we may teach legality, and we shall teach it to the best of our power, but you cannot give security for social order in Ireland. I think I have shown to the right hon. Gentleman the Irish Secretary, on the authority of his Colleague, that we have done something, not to increase, but to diminish his difficulties, which I quite grant are serious enough. But what I fear is that the policy now advanced will again increase those difficulties which we have been struggling, apparently with some success, to diminish, because the Government point out to Ireland the adjournment of her hopes at the very best and the pursuit of measures which she does not want, and which, although offered to her as boons, she is likely to receive rather with resentment than with gratitude. In fact, the noble Lord and his Colleagues offer a prolongation of a controversy already too long, and the postponement as long as their efforts can postpone it, of that consummation which alone can give rest and repose to Ireland, and alone can bring to a close the period of its political agitation.

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) said, that the other night he had thought it necessary, in view of recent events that had occurred, to point to future dangers that would inevitably arise in Ireland, and he was sorry to say that they had already come into existence. In the South of the County Galway, the Eastern portion of which he represented, disturbances had already taken place, owing to the determination of the Marquess of Clanricarde, an absentee Nobleman, to exterminate his poor tenantry about Woodford. The noble Marquess never visited Ireland, and never paid any attention to the large interests that he had under his charge in Ireland, except the interest of collecting his rents. His poor tenantry in that wild mountainous district had mainly reclaimed their holdings from barrenness; and if they were to be paid for their improvements, the noble Marquess who was now engaged in the terrible work of evicting them would have very little indeed to add to his receipts in the way of rent. It was a pitiable thing that this noble Marquess should be allowed to evict and to exterminate these poor people. There appeared to be a general feeling in both Houses of Parliament in favour of the creation of a peasant proprietary; but how was it that such proprietaries were not established? He could not understand why it was that Parliament should get into a state of paralysis with regard to the Irish Question. It was admitted that the establishment of a peasant proprietary in Ireland was the only final settlement of this question. Yet the House did not legislate on the subject, while it refused to allow an Irish Parliament to take it in hand. If the House was in such a paralytic condition that they could not legislate properly in regard to Irish affairs, they had much better allow Ireland to do so herself. If the people of Ireland had the government of their country under their own control for 12 months, they would establish a peasant proprietary on a just and sound basis. The hon. Member was going to speak of the bearing of religious differences upon Irish tenants, when he was interrupted by

MR. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.), who, rising to Order, inquired whether the hon. Member's remarks were relevant to the Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER replied that they were not.

MR. HARRIS then offered some observation upon butter, whisky, and other Irish produce, upon which

MR. SPEAKER informed him again that he was wandering from the Question.

MR. HARRIS, resuming, said, he did not see why the House should look with such especial tenderness on the rights of landlords, or treat them differently from other men who found their means of living in other ways than from the land. They were only entitled to get the market value of their property, and they were not a class of men who were deserving of consideration by reason of the consideration they had shown for the people.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being present,

MR. HARRIS, resuming, said, a very slight acquaintance with the state of things that existed and had existed in Ireland, England, and Scotland, would show that the landlords were the most merciless, inconsiderate, cruel, inhuman, anti-social, and anti-national class of men that existed.

MR. HEATH (Lincolnshire, Louth) said, that the Conservative Members had been told that they were, by the Irish Land Purchase proposals of the Government, called on to violate or give up all the pledges which they had given at the last Election. Now, he did not deny that most of them were steeped to the lips in pledges against the Land Purchase Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, and the Conservative Party had, no doubt, gained many seats by those pledges; but he (Mr. Heath) contended that the proposals of the present Government stood on a very different footing from the proposals of the late Government. He represented a constituency containing 8,000 agricultural labourers, and he should be the last man to support any policy which risked any part of their hard-earned money. Now, the investment of the English taxpayers, money, which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian proposed, was one on which no prudent man or man of business would have lent his money; because, if the Home Rule Bill of the late Government had been passed, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his followers would have been in power in Ireland. That hon. Member had said that rent ought only to be paid on Irish land at prairie value —something like 3*d*., 6*d*., or 1*s*. per acre. How could he, after saying that, tell the

Irish people that they ought to pay for the holdings at the price of 20 years' judicial rents. Was it likely that the hon. Gentleman and his supporters would have gone back when in power, on what they had said when out of power? It was clear that those who would have been in power, if the Home Rule Bill had passed, could not compel the people of Ireland to pay their existing rent, or anything like it, to the Government instead of to their landlords; and that was why he went against the Land Purchase proposals of the late Government. But it seemed to him (Mr. Heath) that the so-called Land Purchase proposals of the present Government were very different. In the first place, they did not reach to nearly so large an amount as the £150,000,000 which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) calculated would be involved in the proposals of the late Government, and the security of the money to be advanced, if it was advanced, was the whole power of the British Government, the pledges of the present Government, and the existing law under which a certain amount of rents in Ireland, and all rents in England, were now paid. All that the Chancellor of the Exchequer desired was simply to carry out in an enlarged and improved form the Land Act of 1885, for which they were indebted to Lord Ashbourne. The money hitherto advanced under the Act had so far returned the rate of interest at which it was lent. Then, the Government of Ireland was not now in the hands of Gentlemen who maintained that land in Ireland was only of prairie value. The English money advanced to Land Improvement Companies was now considered to be invested on as good security as any in England. If money was advanced by the Government, as they now proposed, it would be the first charge on the land under a settled and established Government. He did not believe that the Conservative Leaders were going to ask their followers to revoke or in any way to go against their pledges, and they would support them confidently in the belief that the proposals they made were in no way contrary to the pledges hon. Members had made. The proposals did not contemplate the transfer of the land of Ireland forcibly from one class to another, nor did they involve the Government of Ireland being placed in the hands of men who held, as he already said, that the tenants in Ireland ought to have the land at prairie value. He looked with entire approval on the proposal to establish fishery harbours on the West Coast of Ireland. Surely, the great cause of the misery on the West Coast of Ireland, as it was on the West Coast of Scotland, was that there were too many people on the land; and, therefore, unless they were emigrated—a course which he deprecated—the only way to make them flourish was to give them other means of making a livelihood—means that would enable them to eke out their precarious gains from the land by reaping the harvest of the sea. Then, with respect to the proposal to promote works of arterial drainage. In the first place, the construction of these works would immediately furnish a large amount of employment to a large class of the populace by whom it was greatly needed. Then, in the second, the works, when completed, would enable a much larger part of Ireland than at present to be cultivated. He was sorry to see that the population of Ireland was diminishing. By the extension of arterial drainage, that tendency would be checked; because, if they virtually increased the size of the land, they would enable it to support a greater population. Then it was said that the Members on that side of the House were representatives of a class, and that they were proposing to take money from the English people and give it to the Irish landlords. ["Hear, hear!"] Well, it was true that, in one sense, he represented a class, for he represented a nearly purely agricultural constituency, including, as he had already said, 8,000 labourers; but he should certainly be very sorry to propose any expenditure of money by which they would lose, and he did not believe that any loss would be incurred by the expenditure which the Government proposed. He believed that if money was advanced in the manner and under the conditions which they proposed—so far as he understood them—no risk would be incurred by the English taxpayer, and that the Irish would pay the interest on such loans in the same way that they now paid the interest on the money advanced on drainage loans. In fact, he believed that as long as Ireland was united to England, and was under the same Government as at present, there would be a good and safe security for such advances as the Government proposed to make for the promotion of Irish improvements. But he believed that if the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Parnell) and his followers were in power there would be no security at all for any money which might be advanced for Irish purposes.

MR. HANDEL COSSHAM (Bristol) said, that in his belief a great many of the proposals which had been made by the Government merely meant the improvement of the value of landed property in Ireland at the expense of the English taxpayer. The Land Purchase scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian might have been right, or it might have been wrong; but, at any rate, it had this merit, that before one penny could be touched, Ireland was pledged to meet the obligation. Whatever might be said as to the merit of the late Government's proposal, the safety of it could not be questioned. He (Mr. Cossham) listened with great attention to the speech the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered the other evening, and was bound to congratulate him upon the great improvement in his style. He, however, could not agree with the noble Lord's conclusions. The noble Lord maintained that he and his Party had been sent to the House of Commons to maintain the Union with Ireland. He (Mr. Cossham) maintained that the Union had never been seriously attacked. Men might differ as to the methods by which the Union was to be maintained; but those who held the views he did asserted that the best way to secure real union with Ireland was to give the Irish people self-government. So far from endeavouring to quench the national aspirations of the Irish people, they ought to hail them with satisfaction. However much they might fence with the question, he felt confident that they must give Ireland a large share in the control of its own affairs. Every section of a nation knew its own wants better than anyone else; and it would be a very happy day, and they would be relieved of a very great deal of anxiety, when they invited the Irish people to manage their own affairs. That night they were called upon to deal with the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, and he (Mr. Cossham) intended not only to support the Amendment by his voice, but by his vote. He regarded the Amendment as the natural reply to the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he elaborated the schemes by which the present Government intended to meet the wants and wishes and difficulties of Ireland. The proposal to make up the rents of the Irish landlords out of the taxes of the English people was one of the most extraordinary that could be made. Seeing that the noble Lord had ventured to make such a proposition, the hon. Member for Cork had been well advised in bringing forward this Amendment. He was ready to admit that right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench meant to treat Ireland fairly; but he (Mr. Cossham) contended they were mistaken in their views. They took into their view the interest of the landlords simply. He wanted to take into view the interests of the people. He felt that the fundamental error that existed in the minds of many hon. Members was that the people existed for the Government, whereas the Government existed for the people. He had been disappointed that so many hon. Members confined their attention to what was best for the governing classes, and not to what was best for the people in Ireland. It was quite clear that something would have to be done; and he hoped that even from the present Government the House might hear some proposals by-and-bye, out of which they might produce some measures that would tend to the pacification and the future happiness of Ireland. He pleaded that night as an English Member representing a democratic class of people who had to pay taxes—people who would get no advantage out of the making up of the rents of the landlords. On the behalf of these people, he entered his strongest protest against this attempt to prop up the rents of the Irish landlords out of the English taxes. If that proposition ever took a form in which the House could deal with it in a substantial way, he predicted that however much the Government might boast of their majority, that majority would soon melt away. In conclusion, he hoped that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches would not assume that, because the Elections had gone against the view he (Mr. Cossham) and his Friends held, that decision was permanent. More than 2,000,000 of people voted for Home Rule, and a much larger number would have voted for Home Rule had it not been associated with the Land Purchase scheme. The Land Purchase scheme of the late Government was mildness itself in comparison with the view expressed by the present Government, and, therefore, he hoped to see adopted the Amendment which the hon. Member for Cork had moved in a speech of singular ability—a speech in which he appealed not to Irish prejudices, but to English common sense.

Mr. LIONEL COHEN (Paddington, N.) said, he believed that the principles raised by the Amendment would, if they were affirmed, not only injuriously affect the condition of the Irish tenants, but they would also affect, in a large degree, the legislation of the House in a sense which anyone who regarded the economical policy pursued by this country for many years past would regret to see followed. He contended that the terms and language of the Amendment were inconsistent and illogical, and that its scope and tendency were dangerous and mischievous in their nature. As a Member of the recent Commission on the Depression of Trade, he would say that there was no more striking evidence of the depression which affected land in Ireland than that of Mr. M. O'Brien, the Land Commissioner, who superintended the sales under the Act of 1881. It had been stated by the Irish Members that the prices of agricultural produce had fallen 40 per cent since 1881; but that was not the case. Taking all agricultural produce together, it was established that the fall was from 18 to 20 per cent. Of course, it was notorious that the price of wheat had fallen from 30 to 40 per cent; but in Ireland the area of land which produced flax was very nearly as large as the area that produced wheat; and the average fall in the price of flax since 1881 was from 18 to 20 per cent. The reduction made by judicial rents since 1881 up to January 5 this year had been 18·13 per cent; but there had been a fall in rents prior to 1881, whereas the fall in prices was since then; while in the three preceding years, 1878 to 1881, prices were higher than they were in 1881. It was illogical and inaccurate to say that it was owing to the fall in the price of agricultural produce that great difficulty would be experienced in the payment of rents. He granted that the difficulty would be experienced; but it ought not to be connected entirely or mainly with the fall since 1881 in agricultural produce. It was not a question of rent alone in Ireland, or even in England. In many instances in Ireland if the tenants had the land for nothing they could not make a decent living out of land parcelled out into such minute holdings. It was the system of land tenure, and not the rent of the land, that was at fault. As long as it was supposed to be the rent which ground down the people, so long would attention be diverted from the real remedy. In Ireland there were 79,000 tenancies under five acres, 161,000 under 10 acres, and 226,000 under 15 acres. Of the holdings under five acres many were even under three acres. It was absolutely impossible for a man with a family to live out of three acres of the poorest land. It was not alone that economical conditions were different from what they were years ago; but the condition of the peasants of Ireland placed them at a disadvantage as compared with the peasants of Europe. Comparisons had been made between the peasants of Berne and those of Ireland. The peasant girls of Berne were trained to dairy farming, and the children of Berne acquired technical knowledge at school. Kindred advantages in Ireland would do something to relieve its depressed condition. Could any proposition be more dangerous, and, at the same time, more illogical than that contained in the second sentence of the Amendment, which declared that evictions confiscating rights would cause suffering, and endanger the maintenance of social order? He could not understand how evictions could confiscate rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act. If the rights were vested in them, no eviction could confiscate them. A man did not lose his rights by being turned out of doors. If a right were vested in him eviction could not deprive him of it. As to the third sentence of the Amendment, no proposal had been made to transfer the loss arising from the inability of tenants to pay rents from landowners to taxpayers. An attempt had been made to fasten upon words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer a meaning which they would not bear. Land tenure had been put before the House as a political question and as an agrarian question; but it was neither the one nor the other. It might be made political in the same way that any other question was. There was nothing in it that was agrarian, except in so far as the word agrarian implied connection with land. But there was much in the Land Question that was economical. There was much the House had done by which this economical difficulty had been produced. The Land Act of 1881 was the greatest breach of all economical traditions. The fact was they were suffering now from past legislation, and they were asked to repeat that mistake. They were asked to step in again, and to stay evictions and fix rents, not for 15 years, but for three years. The only effect of such policy would be to prevent capital being applied to the land. To embark on a continued course of interference with the relations between Irish landlords and tenants, and to persevere again in the policy on which Parliament erroneously entered into in 1881, would be a fatal step for the House of Commons to take. It had been erroneously said by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had endeavoured to urge the Irish landlords to exact the last pound of rent. He (Mr. Cohen) did not think it was the province of statesmen to urge payment on one side or absention on the other, but to deal with the subject in a judicial spirit. The hon. Member for Cork had alluded to the payment of rents being exacted by a system of Russian coercion. But there was in Ireland a coercion worse than even Russian—and that was the coercion of the National League. [*Home Rule laughter.*] They had an illustration of its power and tyranny in that House, where statements and arguments were met by mechanical laughter. In conclusion, he trusted they had come to the end of the period of mismanagement, and that the House would promote the real welfare of Ireland by supporting the well-considered measures shadowed forth by the Government, which were calculated to raise the condition of the Irish people.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox), said, that as a Liberal Unionist, he had the greatest possible sympathy with the Irish tenants in regard to their holdings. If, as no doubt was the case in England, the farmers were not able to pay their rents, they might fairly assume that much more so was that the case in Ireland, where they had a population depending almost entirely upon agricultural labour. The circumstances of England and Ireland differed in this respect—that in England, and also in Scotland, the agriculturists in addition to their own labour had the advantage of manufactures. In Ireland, they had not this advantage to the same extent, and the result was that the agriculturist in Ireland was entirely dependent upon the land for the upbringing of his family. Having this sympathy with the Irish tenant, he thought the scope of the Commission was too narrow, as he thought it should be extended so as to inquire into the extent and size of the holding; because it made no difference how small the rent might be, if the amount of land upon which the tenant laboured was too small to bring up his family. Therefore, the size of the holding was as important, if not more important, than the amount of rent, and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer would do well to include this in the terms of the Inquiry. Whilst they greatly sympathized with the Irish people, they must nevertheless look at matters as they stood. When the present Government came into Office they found the rent was fixed by Act of Parliament passed by the Liberal Party, and if there ever was an obligation that was to be presumed to have been fair, it was the rent fixed by the Act of 1881. It therefore came to this, were the Government going to see that legal obligations, which had been fixed as right and proper by Act of Parliament, were to be carried out? If legal obligations undertaken under the Act of 1881 were not to be enforced, then what security had the country that, under the Land Purchase Act of the late Government, the rent fixed by that Act would not equally have been repudiated? The prosperity of the country depended upon its ability to enforce and recognize these legal obligations; and if they once destroyed confidence in this direction, the country was bound to go down, and they would soon have no security at all. He admitted there were cases of hardship in regard to the Irish tenant; but had they not cases of hardship in other matters of contract than those relating to landlord and tenant? Had they not banks, where innocent widows and orphans had been brought to starvation by the failure of the banks? And yet the Executive were never appealed to to interfere in their behalf; and in these cases it really amounted to eviction, for, in many cases, even the household furniture was sold off. Were they to interfere in these cases also? Whilst they must acknowledge and might regret the hardships of the law, there was no doubt that the security of the State depended upon maintaining the law, and enforcing just and legal obligations. That being so, he held that the Government coming into power, at the time they did, should give no countenance to any doctrines that did not enforce legal obligations; and surely if ever there was a legal obligation that ought to be enforced it was that entered into under the responsibility of an Act of Parliament. The legal obligation was not of their making; it was the making of the Liberal Party, and it was acknowledged to be just by them in every particular. Reference had been made to the matter of the reduction of rents in England and the generosity of landlords on the Treasury Bench. In the latter instance, the reduction of rents was the result of voluntary action on the part of the landlords; but if these gentlemen had come to the Executive and said—"We wish the legal obligation enforced," the Government of the country must have enforced it here as well as in Ireland. Instead of adopting that course, however, the landlords took the matter into their own hands, and gave the reduction of rent as a matter of generosity to the tenants. What, then, was the distinction between the two cases? It was this—the tenants in Ireland had no legal right, as some maintained they had, to ask Parliament to interfere with the settlement of the Land Act of 1881. They might have a moral right to ask the landlords to make a reduction in the rent; and if they so approached the landlords, he hoped the landlords would meet them in a generous spirit. But, by the teaching that had sprung up, these tenants were not taught to go, as they were in duty bound to go, in the spirit of asking a favour from their landlords, and of receiving a reduction in the same way as that reduction was received in England and Scotland. They were led to believe that they had a legal right, with regard to which this House could interfere, to prevent the landlords from receiving almost any rent at all, whether the land could pay it or not. It seemed to him, therefore, that the Government might have been in the position of saying, strictly and honourably, that they would adhere to the terms of the Act of 1881; but they had gone a little further than that, and had adopted a more generous view—they had said they would inquire into the Act of 1881, and see whether anything could be done for these tenants or not. That, he said, was a concession on the part of the Government which they were not bound to have made, but having made it, it should be generously received, and generously acknowledged. The terms of the inquiry had been explained. If the Government were going to alter the terms of an Act of Parliament, they were bound to take the utmost care by inquiry, before resorting to any change, and that was exactly what the Government proposed to do by the Commission to be issued. The Government did not commit themselves to anything; but they proposed to inquire into whether there were any grounds existing for the change. He was astonished that the debate should proceed upon the supposition that the Government were about to bring forward any scheme of Land Purchase; he thought it irrelevant to go into the question, as there was no such thing referred to in the Queen's Speech, nor in the proposals before the House at the present moment; and it was, therefore, altogether out of Order to be discussing a Land Purchase Bill which was not before the House, and which, according to any information they had from the Government, would not be before the House until the end of next spring, if it was even then. With regard to the first portion of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), the House had no information regarding the fact there stated, and could not of their own knowledge, as a Legislative Assembly, affirm an assertion such as that. With regard to the second part of the Amendment, which dealt with possible numerous evictions, they had no information as to what might take place; and as to the last part of the Amendment, deprecating the loss likely to arise to the taxpayer by the purchase of land from the owners, they had no such proposal before the House, and, therefore, he failed to see how they could deprecate that which was not before them. Under these circumstances, he thought it was his duty to state that, whilst he had the greatest possible sympathy for the Irish tenants, and should like to see the Commission extended in the direction he had indicated, he held that the House was bound to support the legal obligations undertaken by Act of Parliament; and that, if it did interfere with these legal obligations, it was bound to do so with the greatest possible caution, and that the Government, after inquiry, would have to consider how far it could interfere with vested interests conferred by Act of Parliament.

Mr. MASON (Lanark, Mid) said, the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Caldwell) had treated them to a view of the question very much from a legal stand point of view. This, however, was a question of practical importance, affecting the well-being of a great many of our fellow-subjects in Ireland, and as necessity had no law he was afraid they must deal with it in a very different way than looking at it from a legal point of view; and as Parliament had made the law of which they complained, Parliament was perfectly entitled to take steps to amend the law. That, he thought, was a view of the case that would commend itself not only to the House, but to the country. He presumed he was precluded from making any general remarks on the Queen's Speech; but he might be at liberty to make some remarks on the development of the policy which had been divulged by those who had spoken upon the Ministerial side of the House explanatory of the Speech from the Throne. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Well, he would endeavour to keep within the limits as much as possible. The speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave them a view of what the Government intended to do with regard to Ireland, and then they had a very full commentary upon the Speech from the Throne in "another place," to which, however, he would not further allude. They also had had a speech from the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), and one from the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), who seemed to have inspired the whole matter. It was quite clear that from his speech last night the policy of the Government had very largely emanated, and he tried to explain away that by stating that the policy was not yet before the House in the shape of a Bill, so that there was plenty of time to discuss it when it came before the House. Although the Liberal Party were in a minority in the House, yet, with the aid of the country, he believed they would be able to prevent that policy ever becoming an Act, if ever it should get the length of being embodied in a Bill. They would contest it inch by inch, the policy being that they should pay a rent out of the taxpayers' pockets to the landlords of Ireland. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] That seemed to him to be the policy foreshadowed by Her Majesty's Ministry, and he was satisfied that the Liberal Party would be backed up by the country in resisting it to the uttermost. Scottish Members had not much to do with that debate; but representing an industrial and commercial constituency in Lanarkshire, the most important county in Scotland, he intended to enter his protest against the policy that had been foreshadowed by Her Majesty's Ministers. What was that policy? First, it was one of social order, and the whole of these measures the Government were about to introduce were intended to produce a better state of social order in Ireland. He was afraid the Government were going to give Ireland a bribe, and perhaps, also, another taste of coercion; but he thought they had already had enough of coercion. What they wanted was, neither bribery nor coercion, but a policy of conciliation.

Mr. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington), rising to Order, said, he wished to ask if the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) was still before the House, and if the indulgence granted to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was to be extended to private Members?

Mr. SPEAKER: No question arises as to whether the indulgence of the

House is to be granted to any hon. Member; but it is my duty to remind the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Mason) that, while indulgence was extended to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, the hon. Member himself is not confining himself to the subject before the House, which is, the inability of the tenants to pay rents, and the consequences following thereon.

Mr. MASON said, he thought the question of social order was raised under the Amendment, but he bowed to the Chair on the question, and he would confine himself to the question before the House. The question of judicial rents had been raised in consequence of the Irish Land Act of 1881 having fixed the rent for 15 years. That appeared to him at the time to be a blunder, and experience had proved it to be so. As he understood it, they were fixed in 1881 on a basis of the value of produce for the five years preceding. If, then, the value of produce had since fallen 20, 30, or 50 per cent, it was quite clear that rents must now be too high for the people to pay. Under these circumstances, he thought it would be well if the Commission which the Government proposed to appoint would proceed to work at once. Rents were payable in November, and evictions were already going on. That being so, it seemed only just and proper that Parliament should interfere to amend the Act of 1881, that Act having failed by not making provision for such a fall as had taken place. He thought it would be wise for the Government to follow up the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cork, and act promptly with regard to the reconsideration of rents in Ireland. They should send out one of their Commissions immediately, to ascertain what was the actual fall in the price of produce during the last five years. He was sure that if it were found desirable to pass any Act to amend the Land Act of 1881, the House would really do so, and the result might be to prevent a winter of trial and suffering to many of the people of Ireland, and at the same time do a great deal towards preserving social order in that country. That was his practical suggestion, and he would only add that he thought the Amendment which had been proposed by the hon. Member for Cork was wise and well-timed, and he intended, on a division, to give his vote in its favour.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said, he felt bound to preface the observations he wished to make by saying that the practice of allowing speeches to be made by any Member of the House, however distinguished or illustrious, to which no other Members could be permitted to reply without being out of Order, appeared to be inconvenient in the extreme. He desired to limit his observations to the Amendment before the House, and if by any mishap he should travel beyond its scope, he hoped he would receive not less indulgence than was accorded to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian in the long and discursive, and in some respects thoroughly mischievous, speech which he delivered that afternoon. One thing had been too much lost sight of in conection with all their discussion about Ireland; but it had been made perfectly clear by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, and that was that, although, no doubt, the hon. Member was using them for his own political purposes, the causes which lay at the root of all their troubles and difficulties in Ireland were economical rather than political in their character. For that reason, although it met with so much ridicule and opposition from the Opposition side of the House, there was no part of the policy of the Government which commended itself more to his mind than that in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer disclosed the intention and desire of the Government to deal with the question of the development of the material resources of Ireland. The Amendment dealt specifically with two questions—social order and the Land Question. The chief difficulty in Ireland now, as for many years past, was the Land Question. The right hon. Member for Derby had told the House that it was hopeless ever to think of dealing with that question unless they first discovered what was the real evil afflicting the country. He should have thought the right hon. Gentleman might have known what the real evil was. It was that over a large part of the country there was scarcely any means of subsistence for the population apart from the land, and in consequence there had always been an excessive and unnatural demand for its possession. It had been summed up over and over again in debates in that House, and had once been described as "the cancer of the country." It was, and would continue to be, a fruitful source of trouble, unless some means were found of lessening it. If the result of the labours of the smaller Commission promised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer should result in the production of some effectual measures in the direction of encountering that evil, if it should be the means of diverting the attention of any part of the population from the soil and of providing the people with other means of subsistence, it would do more to mitigate and remove the real evil in the country than could be done by any other means that it would be possible for human ingenuity to devise. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had spoken at some length upon the question of rents in Ireland that night, and for his (Mr. Chaplin's) own part he could say that in his humble opinion there was no other man in this country who was so responsible for the present situation with regard to rents, and with regard to the present situation of the Land Question altogether, as the right hon. Gentleman. With all his influence, all his authority, and all the unrivalled power which he had exercised in the House of Commons for so many years, the right hon. Gentleman had never, so far as he could remember, raised a little finger to do anything at all towards attempting to deal with that question, with the exception of two miserable clauses in the Land Act of 1881—one dealing with the question of emigration, and the other with the reclamation of land—both of which had been dealt with in so feeble and ineffectual a manner that he believed he was right in saying that from that moment to this they had remained a dead letter. He remembered that in 1870, when the right hon. Gentleman had introduced his first great Irish Land Bill to the House, the right hon. Gentleman had said—"We take the circumstances and the conditions of Ireland as we find them." Yes; and it was precisely because the right hon. Gentleman had done so—because he took them as he found them, and because he had left them as he found them—that the circumstances and conditions of Ireland had been far more potent than the measures of the right hon. Gentleman, and had vitiated and rendered futile all his great legislative measures. What were those circumstances and conditions? They were perfectly notorious. They were to be found in the miserable condition of the people, especially in the West of Ireland, who were crowded together upon holdings which in a good year were hardly able to afford the means of a miserable subsistence, and which in a bad year meant misery and starvation. The right hon. Gentleman, instead of doing, or attempting to do, anything with this state of things, had confined his attention entirely to the property of one class in Ireland—a class which was numerically small, and which was insufficiently represented in that House—and he had thought that by a sweeping confiscation of their property, and by transferring it to others, he would accomplish the regeneration of Ireland. This policy he had carried out in spite of all protests, with consequences and results which were patent to the world to-day. Among those results was the system of judicial rents, which had been the subject of so much discussion that afternoon. He remembered that in 1870 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had denounced that system, and had proved to demonstration that it could only end in one thing—namely, the complete demoralization of the people of that country. But afterwards, in 1881, the right hon. Gentleman had suddenly found that it was a panacea for all the evils and mischief in Ireland. That system had now completely broken down. Anyone who had viewed the system candidly and without bigotry or ignorance must have seen—and as he always had prophesied—that it must break down. Then the ridiculous pretence was put forward that the coming fall in prices—which had been in everybody's mouth at that time—had never been taken into account by the Commissioners in fixing the judicial rents, and was never contemplated at all by anyone. Why, he himself recollected hearing debates in that House in the year 1881 over and over again—and in which he had taken a considerable part—on the question of the probable fall in agricultural prices; and all the results which would follow from it had been put prominently forward. He had himself moved an Amendment having reference to those very subjects, and had stated his opinion that this constituted a fatal blot in the scheme. That opinion had then been scouted and repudiated by the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) the other night had made very merry about the number of Commissions now being proposed to be appointed by the Conservative Government. For his own part, he (Mr. Chaplin) had not a single word to say against those Commissions; on the contrary, if the Government required more information than they had at present, it was not only their right but their duty to appoint them. But he would remind the House that there had been a good many Commissions already upon these and upon cognate subjects, and that vast stores of information were already at the disposal of the Government and of the House. A Commission appointed three years before under the Duke of Richmond had reported in 1881 upon the whole question of agricultural distress in Ireland. That Commission had been appointed by Lord Beaconsfield; but in the same year—1881—a Commission had been appointed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, known as the Bessborough Commission, which had also reported on the condition of Ireland, and especially upon the working of the Land Act of 1870. Besides these a Committee of the House of Lords had since then inquired into the working of the Land Act of 1881. He wished to remind the House of one or two passages from those Reports, because they bore upon the question of the fall in prices and judicial rents, and whether or not that fall in prices had been taken into account by the Commissioners. The Richmond Commission had reported that, in common with the rest of the United Kingdom, the agricultural depression of the years 1877, 1878, and 1879 had greatly affected Ireland, and that the effect had been increased in Ireland by the absence of manufacturing interests and other sources of employment; that undoubtedly the depression had fallen with extreme severity upon the smaller farmers and small holders in the West of Ireland; and that they were satisfied that, with the slightest failure of the crop of these people, they would be unable to subsist on the produce of their farms even if they paid no rent at all. It made no difference whether the failure was in the crops or in the prices, and this Report showed that that there was evidence which must have led the Commissioners to take these matters into account. But in the Report of the Bessborough Commission there was much stronger evidence to this effect, and the principle of the Act of 1881, which had created these Commissioners, had been framed to a very large extent upon the Report and recommendations of that Commission. In their Report they had expressly referred to the question of future variations in the price of agricultural produce as affecting the length of time for which rent should be fixed. In the face of such evidence he would ask how it was possible to contend that judicial rents had been fixed in the past by the Commissioners without taking into account any probable fall in prices? The Commissioners appointed under the Act of 1881 were supposed to be men not merely of ordinary common sense but of exceptional ability, and yet now the hon. Member for Cork told them that they had taken no consideration of these Reports. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had taken the Chancellor of the Exchequer considerably to task for some language which he had used in the opening night of the debate, and had said that the speech of the noble Lord was not only a direct encouragement to evictions, but was a direct discouragement to any remissions of rent. For his (Mr. Chaplin's) own part, he thought that was a totally false construction of the speech of his noble Friend, and one which was not in any way warranted by what had been said. What the noble Lord had said was, that if the rents could not be paid then the landlord was entitled to the restoration of his land. A contrast had been drawn to-day by the hon. Member for Cork between the practice in England and the practice in Ireland, and said that they should follow the practice adopted in England between landlords and tenants when the latter got into difficulties. But great difference in practice was one of the mischievous results which followed from the Land Act of 1881, and which had been always foreseen and predicted. They should remember that measure destroyed all the old, what were sometimes called the "feudal," but what he believed were the kindly relations which existed between the vast majority of the landlords and tenants in Ireland. He was not going to defend all the landlords in Ireland; they knew very well there were black sheep in every flock; but would the hon. Member for Cork tell him that it was not the old landlords who were looked up to and revered, and that it was not the new landlords who had been guilty of many of the evil deeds he so frequently denounced? By that Act hon. Gentlemen destroyed all those kindly relations for the future and placed their countrymen on a strictly legal and commercial footing, and they made it their boast at the time that they had done so. Therefore the burden of the care of those poor impoverished people ought to fall, not upon the landlords, but upon the shoulders of those who had brought such a state of things about. When the Act of 1881 was passed a solemn binding contract was entered into between the State on the one hand and the landlords and tenants on the other. He did not mean that the State guaranteed that the landlords should always receive the full judicial rent; but it distinctly guaranteed him two things—first, that until the expiration of the statutory term there should be no interference with the judicial rent so far as the action of the State was concerned; and, secondly, that if from any cause the judicial rent should not be paid the landlord should be restored to the use of the land which belonged to him. That was a distinct obligation of honour and good faith between the State on the one hand and the two contracting parties on the other; and if he had to choose between honour and good faith and the spoliation of the landlords, he could not depart from the obligations of honour and good faith, even if he was left no other alternative than that the Irish tenants should be evicted, or that the burden of purchase should be placed upon the shoulders of the State. He regretted it exceedingly, but the fault lay not with hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, but with the authors of the measure. The present state of things was the first chapter in the lesson which he suspected vast numbers of the English people had yet to learn—namely, that their admiration, their worship, and their blind support in all his foolish measures for many years past of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was going to turn out, in the long run, the most expensive luxury that ever was indulged in by any people in any country in the world. The hon. Member for Cork concluded what had been described to-night as an "impressive and cold-blooded speech" by a suggestion which he desired to notice. He proposed that the whole of the judicial rents in Ireland should be revised, and the statutory period reduced from 15 years to three. Had the hon. Member forgotten the number of years that were taken to fix the judicial rents in force at present? If he had not, he would have known that his proposition was totally impracticable. Unless he was misinformed, there were at the present moment 4,000 applications for judicial rents which were in arrear; and yet the hon. Member was good enough to suggest and recommend to the Government that the whole of the judicial rents in Ireland should be revised, and that was to be accomplished before November next. [MR. PARNELL: Upon the basis of prices.] There was no official record of agricultural prices, so far as he (Mr. Chaplin) knew; and, if that was so, that made the hon. Member's position worse than it was before. He did not wish to delay the House. He only desired to make one observation more. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman contemplated further disorders in Ireland; and he gathered from the hon. Member that he endorsed the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as to the imprudence of postponing the next Session until February instead of holding it in the autumn. Well, he confessed that at one time he had some considerable misgivings on that subject himself. But whatever doubts he had entertained were dispelled by the clear, able, and conclusive speech which fell from his noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the opening night of the debate. He ventured to offer his hearty and sincere congratulations to his noble Friend on the statement which he made on that occasion, and also, if he might be allowed to do so without being chargeable with undue presumption, on his having attained the distinguished position in which it became his duty to deliver it. One thing, at all events, was made perfectly clear by the statement which the noble Lord delivered—that Her Majesty's Government most certainly did not underrate the importance of the question of social order and the means of restoring and maintaining it in Ireland. For they announced their determination to leave absolutely nothing undone, within the resources of the ordinary law, to restore it. And, more than that, his noble Friend gave the House and the country a plain and specific pledge that if by any mishap the Government found the ordinary law unequal to the task, and failed them, then they should not hesitate to summon Parliament together without delay and ask for further powers. To this, at least, his noble Friend said he could pledge the Government—that the very moment they became conscious of their inability to perform the first duty of a Government—namely, to enforce the law—at that moment they would call Parliament together, and ask with confidence for whatever measures they might deem necessary. Nothing could be more emphatic than that declaration, and it ought to dispel any anxiety with regard to the upholding of the law in Ireland. He might not, he supposed, say a few words upon the general policy of the Government; but with the indulgence of the House he would ask to be allowed to say that, on the whole, he cordially approved and endorsed the policy indicated in the speech of his noble Friend. There was one point, however, on which, he was sorry to say, he differed altogether from the Government. He differed in the views which his noble Friend announced with regard to the extension of a large scheme of local government to Ireland concurrently with England, when Parliament met in February. But he would not dwell upon that question now, because there would be many opportunities of doing so when the measures of the Government were before the House. Hon. Members from Ireland had been exceedingly courteous to him on this occasion, and he would conclude with one word of appeal to them. The hon. Member for Cork had told the House that he did not regard the late decision of the country as conclusive in any degree. How could the hon. Member and his Friends ever hope to fight the question under more favourable auspices? They had fought it under the most powerful and most popular statesman the country had seen for years. More than that, they had appealed to an electorate which had just been enormously enlarged by the same right hon. Gentleman, and in whose favour, by every sense of gratitude and interest, that electorate was likely to be prejudiced rather than the reverse. But, notwithstanding all that, no question was ever decided in a more complete and emphatic manner, and it was decided against them.

Mr. MASON (Lanark, Mid) rose to a point of Order. He said he had been stopped in his remarks, and had been called to Order for discussing the general question; and the right hon. Gentleman ought not to be allowed to go beyond the discussion of the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that he was the judge of Order in that House; and he would call any hon. Member to Order if occasion required. He must be allowed to say that, although, certainly, the argument of the right hon. Gentleman had no immediate connection with the Amendment, yet he understood the right hon. Gentleman was about to conclude his remarks; and, therefore, he (Mr. Speaker) did not interpose.

Mr. CHAPLIN said, he would best consult the convenience of the House and the propriety of the situation if he should conclude by one word of appeal to the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends, and it was this. After all Ireland had gone through, after all the trouble she had endured for many years, after the decided verdict which had been given at the General Election, was it not evident to them that it would be for the welfare and the prosperity of Ireland that they should let that unhappy country have, at least, an interval of peace?

Mr. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossory): I hope, Sir, that in speaking for the first time I may receive from the House, as a whole, as much kindness as I have received from individual Members, of all shades of opinion, when making my way through the House. In regard to the present debate, I think the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) may fairly be called the Cassandra of Irish politics. Again and again he has told English Governments what he knows about the state of Ireland; what he believes will be the proper course to pursue, in order to restore peace and order in that country, and what the consequences will be if his advice is disregarded. Yet over and over again the hon. Gentleman has been told that his knowledge is of no account; that his advice will not be listened to, and that his prophecies are all wrong. But, Sir, in spite of all that the time will come when English Governments will discover that the advice tendered to them was not so bad, and the prophecies not so foolish, as they, in their arrogance and self-conceit, suppose. The hon. Gentleman has suggested certain changes which he thinks will, in some measure, tide the Government over their present difficulties. One of his suggestions is that the judicial rents should be fixed for three years; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin), who has just sat down, says that this would take a great deal of time, and when he is reminded by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork that he has said "on the basis of prices," the right hon. Gentleman says there is no authentic source from which the basis of prices can be ascertained. I wonder whether the right hon. Gentleman has ever heard of *Thom's Almanack;* whether he knows that there is any such person as Thom; that there is such a publication as *Thom's Almanack;* that, as a matter of fact, Thom is the Queen's printer in Ireland; and that the information which he supplies to the public is of the most authentic character? Then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork says that leaseholders ought to be included within the benefits of the Act. Well, I scarcely think that any Member of this House will regard that as a very foolish suggestion on the part of the hon. Gentleman in the face of the fact that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) and the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) have introduced a Bill with the very object of including leaseholders in the benefits of the Act. Therefore, I take it for granted that no one will regard the proposal of my hon. Friend as absurd and extravagant. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) told the House to-night that the hon. Member for Cork had drawn a fearful picture in those cold-blooded tones to which the House is so much accustomed. Well, I think the right hon. and learned Gentleman cannot have a particularly good ear; for I venture to think—and I believe my ear is tolerably good—that I have never in my life heard words spoken in a tone which implied more deep concern than those which were spoken by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork. We in this part of the House do not find the hon. Gentleman cold-blooded; but then we are only his followers and friends. We think we know him; we are sure that you do not. I shall keep, Sir, in the few observations I propose to address to the House, very closely to the terms of the Amendment, as I am very anxious—and I hope I shall always be so—to obey implicitly the ruling of the Chair. The Amendment, as I understand it, deals with four principal questions—judicial rents, evictions, social order, and the land proposals of the Government. Now, with regard to judicial rents, the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down declared that they were fixed by the same Commissioners who were the authors of the Bessborough Report. [Mr. Chaplin: No!] I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon if I am misrepresenting what he said.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): What I said was, that provision was made for them by the Land Act of 1881.

Mr. W. A. MACDONALD: I am quite aware that the Commissioners were appointed in pursuance of the Act of 1881; but it does not follow that as there were different Commissioners, and as the rents were fixed by a number of Sub-Commissioners who were different persons altogether, that, therefore, every word contained in the Report of the Bessborough Commission was carried out. The truth is that those of the Sub-Commissioners who were particularly friendly to the tenants were either dismissed or not re-appointed; and the Sub-Commissioners in general fixed the judicial rents, not according to any defined or well-understood principle, but according to the political exigencies of the time. At the time they were first appointed Ireland was in a state of tremendous agitation; it had just been passing through the most terrible crisis it has passed through in our day; and as a consequence, because there was this outcry, the judicial rents were pulled down considerably. But, as time went on, I think I am correct in saying—although if I had time

I should prefer to quote the Reports which the Commissioners have published year after year—the abatements in the rents became less, because the country was more quiet. In regard to the fall in prices I say—and I defy any hon. Member on the other side of the House to disprove my assertion---that the Sub-Commissioners did not take into account the permanent fall in the price of agricultural produce to the extent which they ought to have done. The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) asks whether the House can believe that the Sub-Commissioners could have fixed the rents without considering the bad years? Now, the right hon. Gentleman has a singular faculty for misconceiving the point of his opponent's argument. No one on these Benches ever stated that the Sub-Commissioners had disregarded bad years. What we did say was that that which was patent to all the world was neglected by the Sub-Commissioners—namely, that the foreign competition—the competition of American and Australian produce—was not likely to get less, and that instead of standing still it was calculated to increase as the facilities of intercommunication increased, and that with that increase of facilities the fall of prices would continue, and so there would be brought about, as a necessary consequence, a further inability on the part of the tenants to pay rents. We maintain that these things ought to have been taken into account by the Sub-Commissioners. But we are told that the judicial rents are to be enforced in full, and that they are to be enforced with all the power of the law, because the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who opened the debate on the part of Her Majesty's Government, does not believe the statement as to the tenants being unable to pay the judicial rents. Well, Sir, we do not know how the noble Lord arrived at that conclusion. I am afraid that he arrived at it in virtue of that faculty of intuitive knowledge which he so modestly disclaims for himself and his Colleagues. Certainly, the authorities are all the other way; but then they are authorities who only profess to base their opinion on facts and experience; and we all know, of course, that intuition is higher than either. The authority of Sir James Caird has been quoted; but it has been said that Sir James Caird, in a subsequent letter to *The Times*, explained that he had been misinformed, and that he was misunderstood. Now, I maintain that no words could have been plainer than those which were written by Sir James Caird—namely, that from 538,000 holdings in Ireland all economic rent had for the present disappeared. These words are plain enough to anyone who knows anything of political economy, although, perhaps, there are some hon. Members on the other side of the House who do not know very much about political economy. All I can say of the words of Sir James Caird is that if these words are not clear and plain they have certainly been used for the purpose of concealing his thoughts. Then there is another authority I do not think the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer will feel disposed entirely to dispute —I mean Dr. Walsh, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Walsh says that he looks with the gravest apprehension to the coming winter in Ireland; and he endorses the opinion, so freely expressed in other quarters, as to the inability of the people to pay the judicial rents in full. ["Oh, oh!"] Will any hon. Member venture to affirm that Dr. Walsh, with his episcopal authority, would state a fact like that, or be a party to any assertion which did not appear to him to be clearly true? [*Renewed cries of* "Oh!"] I am sorry to hear that mark of disapproval from that side of the House. I am myself an Irish Protestant; but I have learned to respect the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland; and I may tell hon. Gentlemen opposite that if they only knew Ireland one-thousandth part as well as these gentlemen know it there would be a much better chance that they would be able to govern it. Judicial rents are to be enforced to the full, and the enforcement is to be carried out by all the power of the Crown. Well, Sir, I say that as sure as the sun will rise to-morrow, so sure, when the judicial rents are thus enforced, will there be crime in Ireland. There must be crime in Ireland, because of the record which the Irish landlords have in the past, and because of the terrible consequences which must result to the tenants if these evictions are carried out. We have been told by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works that evictions are becoming fewer in Ireland; and in proof of that assertion he has quoted some authority or document, which he does not exactly define, which is a year old, and which, as far as I can make out, is a document which has never been laid on the Table of this House. Sir, has the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and have Her Majesty's Government, read of the evictions in Gweedore last week? Do they know anything about those evictions? Do they know anything whatever about Gweedore? Probably a good many of them never heard that such a place existed. I, however, have visited it; and I know Gweedore well. I can assure hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite that there is such a place, and that the parish priest of Gweedore is a clergyman whose name is held in honour in every cabin in Donegal. I can also testify to the industry of the people of the district, who go every summer to Scotland in order to try and earn enough to pay the miserable rent that is due to the exacting landlord. They are honest; they are industrious; and, so far, there has been no crime among them. The land which they occupy is of the most miserable kind, consisting of stones and rocks, interspersed with little patches of clay upon which the people plant their potatoes and oats, which are the only means they have of subsistence, except what they earn by working in other countries. These are the people whom the landlords have been evicting; and it is scenes like these, in every part of Ireland, which your policy will protect. Sir, we have heard of the desperate condition of the county of Kerry. I know Kerry. I visited it in 1883; and what did I find there? I found a gentleman, whose name has been more than once quoted in these debates—Mr. Hussey, who was formerly the agent of Lord Kenmare and of a number of other gentlemen having property in the locality, who thought him an exceedingly efficient agent. But he carried out his work with very little regard for the feelings of the people. I was assured that not only had Mr. Hussey, the land agent of Lord Kenmare, put the people out upon the roadside—men, women, and children—to perish, or take refuge in the workhouse or in an emigrant ship, but, as if to make the cup of their misery overflow, he actually burned their cabins to the ground after he had turned them out upon the roadside. [*Laughter.*] Sir, any man who can laugh at that must have the heart of a stone. Are these the scenes hon. Members opposite desire to see in every part of Ireland?—for if the policy of Her Majesty's Government be carried out they are certainly the scenes you will see. And do you suppose that such scenes can pass off without outrages and crime? I am satisfied that if one-half of the tyranny were exercised by the landlords of England that is exercised by the landlords in Ireland the people would long since have risen as one man, and got rid of the whole squad of landlords. No, Sir; there will be crime as a result of these evictions; and how do you propose to deal with the question of social order? You propose to deal with it entirely by itself. I should have thought you had had enough experience of the folly and absurdity of a course like that. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) told us the other night something about the absurdity of this policy of treating the question of social order by itself. He did not quote—possibly he could hardly have been expected to quote that, which there will be no impropriety if I quote—namely, a precedent in recent Irish history, which must be fresh in the knowledge of hon. Members, and which most conclusively proves my point—I mean the case of Earl Spencer. Earl Spencer governed Ireland from May, 1882, until February or March, 1885. When he entered upon that task he had an advantage, from your point of view, which you are not likely to possess again. Public opinion had been so outraged by the Phœnix Park assassinations that the House of Commons was willing to give the noble Earl very exceptional powers by passing such a Coercion Act as had been unknown during this generation. Earl Spencer was empowered to prevent the reading and circulation of all American newspapers in Ireland. He could stop public meetings; he could allow juries to be packed; he could change the venue to such an extent that Irish-speaking peasants from Connemara could be tried in Dublin by people who did not know one single word of their language. He could do this, and he could do a great deal more; and he did it. And what was the result? You say that he restored social order. Everybody knows, as was publicly stated by Lord Monteagle in a letter to one of the London journals, that at the time when that coercion reign of Earl Spencer came to an end England was hated in Ireland as she had never been hated before. Now, Sir, that is a very pertinent example for this House, and it bears most closely upon social order. Do you expect to succeed where Earl Spencer failed? If you do, you have a much better opinion of your own capacity than hon. Members on this side of the House entertain. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works said that the hon. Member for Cork had drawn a terrible picture. No doubt it was a terrible picture, and if it should come true it will not be through his doing, but yours. The hon. Member showed exactly how it will be brought about. First of all, you will insist upon carrying out the law to the full, and it is all to be done as a sacrifice to the delightful English fetish of law and order. That will be the first thing. There will then be evictions, and these evictions will be followed by crime. Her Majesty's Government will then come to this House and demand fresh powers. They will probably get them; a Coercion Act will follow. We (the Irish Members) will stand by our people, and the consequence will be that you will not distinguish between criminals and your political opponents; and so, ultimately, in order that your dark deeds may not be exposed by us on this side of the House, you will suspend the Constitutional rights of the Irish people, and govern Ireland like a Crown Colony. [*Cries of* "Question!"] That is what I maintain. Well, I do not know, of course, how far all that will happen; but I do know this—that the Conservatives in this House appear to consist of three classes; first of all, the Conservatives who mean kindly towards Ireland, and who acknowledge all the good qualities of the Irish people; secondly, those who take the very unjust view with respect to Ireland which is exhibited by hon. Gentlemen of the mental and moral calibre of the hon. Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool (Mr. W. F. Lawrence), who spoke the other night after the right hon. Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. John Morley), the late Chief Secretary for Ireland; and, thirdly, there is another class to which Conservative Governments belong—men who shut their eyes and refuse to see what is patent to everybody else. I say that these things may come about, and it will, indeed, be a very terrible picture. But, Sir, if they do come about, there will be a streak of dawn after the night, and it will arise in this way. What do you suppose the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne, or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, or the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) will be doing when Her Majesty's Government are thus violating the Constitution, and bringing all these measures to bear upon Ireland? [*Cries of* "Question!"] I believe I am speaking to the question, for I am dealing with the question of social order. What do you suppose these right hon. Gentlemen and those who sit on this side of the House will be doing while you are thus violating the Constitution? They will be carrying on the education of the masses of the English people; already something is beginning to be known of the abominations of English rule in Ireland—already something is beginning to be known, through the writings of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) and others, about the horrible acts of Irish landlordism; and the English people, knowing all this, will not long be satisfied to keep the present Administration in power.

MR. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington): I rise to a point of Order. I wish to know whether the hon. Member is speaking to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell)?

An hon. MEMBER: You do not like to hear the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member (Mr. Gent-Davis) will observe that in the Amendment the words "the maintenance of social order" appear. At the same time, I may remark that the mere existence of those words in the Amendment, taken with the context, do not raise the question of social order and make it the principal subject of discussion. The Main Question now before the House is the question of the eviction of Irish tenants, and the debate must be confined to that.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD: Well, Sir, I can only say that when the result shadowed forth in the speech of the hon. Member for Cork is brought about these right hon. Gentlemen will not be idle, and the true character of your government will be patent to the people of England. And when that day arrives the present Administration will be hurled from Office amid ignominy and disgrace, because they will have brought shame upon the name of freedom-loving England, and because they will have proved their utter incapacity to govern Ireland at all.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Like the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Macdonald), I venture to make a very earnest appeal for that indulgence which this House always extends to a Member who rises to address it for the first time. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) practically raises the question upon which my own election was carried in Tyrone. I cannot possibly give a silent vote upon it, and my sense of duty does not allow me to walk out of the House without giving a vote. I was returned for a typical agricultural constituency. I was sent to this House by the tenant farmers of South Tyrone. These men resisted every appeal to their cupidity that could be made; they threw aside the tempting creed of agrarian Socialism that was placed before them; and although, Sir, I am very reluctant to speak in this House during the first week of its meeting, I do not think that I should be justified in allowing the views and the feelings of the farmers of South Tyrone to pass without some explanation in this House. Sir, as regards the question of judicial rents I desire to put before the House the case which was put before myself by these farmers. I submit that the men who sent me here have no desire to rob any landlord, or any desire to confiscate any man's property. What they said to me during the contest amounted to this. The judicial rents were fixed in 1881, 1882, and 1883. Under the conditions then existing they were fair rents; and had those conditions remained intact we should have felt ourselves bound in honour to pay them without a murmur. But it is right I should inform the House that those conditions, in the opinion of my constituents, do not continue to exist. Butter, which is one of the staple commodities of Ireland, was 1*s.* per lb. in 1882; it is now selling in the Ulster markets at 6*d.* Stock brings only half the price it fetched in 1882 and 1883, while all other kinds of agricultural produce have suffered a like depreciation. My constituents were constantly assuring me throughout my contest that if that depreciation in agricultural produce was to continue the rent would become impossible of payment; and they would not be able, and they did not think they ought to be asked, to bear the entire burden. Sir, I desired to recognize the justice of the case as regarded both parties; and I said then to the tenant farmers, on a score of platforms, what I venture to repeat to this House now. These facts bring grave duties to the door of every Irish landlord. If the land does not produce the rent, the rent cannot be paid. But, Sir, I was always careful to tell my constituents what I fear that hon. Members below the Gangway are apt to forget—that if the landlord had grave duties corresponding duties lay on the tenant I told these men, as fairly and as squarely as I could, that while landlords were bound to consider the situation—and I know, of my own knowledge, that many of them have done so, and are ready to do it again—it was also the duty of the tenants, by the exercise of thrift, industry, skill, and sobriety, to do their share in the desperate circumstances in which they are placed. Now, Sir, that is the tenants' case; and let us hear, in all fairness, what the landlord has to say for himself. He has also a case. I heard the speech of the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Galway (Mr. Harris) the other night—and if that hon. Member can say it I think the entire Party can say it also—that it is not unjust for the landlord to look for his rent. The landlord's case is this—if a tenant complains to him, and he is a needy man—for all landlords are not rolling in wealth—he probably tells the tenant that he had nothing to do with the fixing of his rent; that that was taken out of his hands by the measure passed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone); that that rent was now fixed by a tribunal perfectly independent of him, the landlord.

The landlord would also, in all probability, remind the tenant of what is true at this moment, regarding the Province of Ulster at any rate—namely, that there is a promise, I am thankful to say, of a more than average harvest. [*Cries of* "No!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] Sir, I will admit the fall in prices; but I would ask the tenant, if the prices had gone up, would the landlords have been benefited during the existence of the judicial lease? I maintain that this House is bound to look at both sides of the question; and it would commit a very grave error, indeed, if it came to a decision on the mere statement of either one party or the other to the quarrel. The Government are face to face with a grave difficulty. They do not propose to shut the door in the tenant's face. If they did, I should vote with the hon. Member for Cork. They simply say that being called upon to undo a great national contract, solemnly entered into, they cannot do so without adequate inquiry into the facts of the case. Sir, I think they are right; and allow me to add this. This inquiry has been much ridiculed. Now, I venture to say that if we had had a little more inquiry lately and a little less haste in legislation, the Liberal Party would not have been in the state of confusion in which they find themselves to-day, and the country might have been spared the turmoil of a General Election, which it had no desire to engage in. Sir, the real question, to my mind, is this—do the Government mean business by this Commission? I am a young Member of this House. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] Yes; but I have spent a great many years about these premises, and I candidly confess that I am very hostile to Royal Commissions and inquiries of this kind. They frequently mean delay, and they are very often floated for the mere purpose of shelving inconvenient questions. If I thought delay was possible in this case I should vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. It is because I think the Government is bound to inquire—because I think there is a case for inquiry; and because I think they are honest in their determination to inquire, and to legislate, that I shall vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, if he carries it to a division. I do so because I think the Government entitled to time; because I think it more to the tenants' interest that an inquiry should be held; and because I desire to see the rents settled in the manner pointed out by the hon. Member for Cork on the basis of prices, and not by any rule of thumb in the Sub-Commissioners' Courts. Hon. Gentlemen have been talking here to-night about the principle adopted in a Land Court for the settlement of rents. Sir, there has been no principle whatever adopted—none; and I am satisfied that if any hon. Member were to go into the Court and ask any one of the Commissioners upon what principle he has acted in giving his decisions he would not get a rational answer to the question. Many of the Sub-Commissioners appointed under the Land Act were men who knew nothing about land at all. They went into the Court, and simply struck an all-round reduction of 23 or 24 per cent; and the consequence was that the good landlords — the men who had never raised their rents—were the very men who were punished severely. Landlords who had raised their rents within the last 12 or 15 years simply suffered the same reduction as other landlords who had not raised their rents for 50 or 60 years. I support Her Majesty's Government because I desire to see this inquiry undertaken, and because I desire also to see the leaseholders included in the Act of 1881. Why were they excluded? I do not think it is fair to found an impeachment against the Government upon that ground; because the main reason why the leaseholders, who number 100,000, and are composed of the very cream of the tenant farmers of Ireland, are outside the scope of the Land Act has been the persistent refusal of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), and right hon. Gentlemen acting with him on the Front Bench, to allow them to come in. I desire further to see the holders of town parks and the purchasers of glebe lands brought under the Act of 1881, so that they may share in the benefits which that Act confers. I therefore prefer taking my chance of the result of the proposed inquiry, with its possible effects upon the tenant, to voting for a mere empty Amendment for which the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) himself declines to vote. I have no desire to occupy the attention of the House; but I wish to say that no matter what may be said about national sentiment—and everybody in this House knows the strength of that sentiment—the real question in Ireland—the question that goes down deep into Irish life, is the Land Question, and not the National Question. If Her Majesty's Government can do anything for the 120,000 small farmers who are starving in the West, and in the wilds of Donegal—if they can, by any development of Irish resources, take the pressure from the land and let something like daylight into the dismal cabins there, they will have done a service for which the country will be bound to speak them well. Sir, I shall vote for the Government all the more readily, because I do not enter this House as a partizan. I came to this House determined to vote as my conscience directed me, either for or against the Government.

Dr. TANNER (Cork County, Mid): You never had one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has made use of a most improper and un-Parliamentary expression, which I must ask him at once to withdraw.

Dr. TANNER: I beg to withdraw the remark.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Sir, I shall vote all the more readily with the Government on this question, because I believe that their programme is a wise one. They have undertaken to make a resolute effort to restore law and order in Ireland; and whether that effort is made in Belfast or in Kerry I am with them in the making of it, and I hope that they will resolutely adhere to the task they have undertaken. They have promised to consider various other matters going deep down into the condition of Ireland. I trust they will proceed resolutely, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left in what they consider to be the path of duty.

Mr. MAHONY (Meath, N.): As one of the Gentlemen who, for three years, served as an Assistant Commissioner under the Land Act, I may, perhaps, be allowed to claim the attention of the House for a short time. In November, 1881, I was offered an appointment under the Land Act, which I gladly accepted, because, at that time, I heartily approved of the action of the Liberal Government with reference to the Land Question in Ireland, and I felt grave doubts whether my hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) was fully justified in the opposition which he raised to the Government at that time. But, Sir, three years of hard work in connection with that Land Commission—three years spent in inquiry into the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland—have convinced me that my hon. Friend the Member for Cork was not only justified, but that his action was absolutely necessary. That is the reason why I now consider it an honour—and a very high honour—to belong to the Party which my hon. Friend so ably leads. The present Government, as I understand, take their stand on the Act of 1881. I have read, Sir, of a law which came from a higher source than even the law of this land; and I have read of a body of men who, while regarding literally and most exactly the letter of the law, managed so effectually to kill its spirit that they escaped from some of its most essential obligations. Sir, the spirit of the Act of 1881, if I understand that Act at all, is divided into three main principles. The landlord was not to have the power to demand from the tenant more than a fair rent, which rent was not to encroach upon the property of the tenant. So long as the landlord received such rent he was not to have the power of evicting the tenant. The third principle was that the tenant was to have the right to sell his interest in his holding. But, Sir, as regards the statutory term of 15 years, which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to consider such a sacred thing, I maintain that it was a mere accident of the Bill, and that it is in no way one of the principles of the Act. Then, if we can show that the maintenance of this mere accident would destroy the spirit of the Act, I think the Government must either abandon their present position, or else they will stand convicted of a desire to strangle the spirit of the law by a strict adherence to the letter. Now, as regards judicial rents, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer tells us he is not prepared to admit that they are too high, even under present circumstances; and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant asks this question—"Can it be supposed that the Commissioners did not take into consideration any possible fall in prices?" Now, Sir, I am afraid that, unless they were inspired—and I, for one, was certainly not inspired—they could not possibly have foreseen the terrible state of depression which has overtaken the agricultural interest. What was the state of things when we began our work? We had passed through a period of great depression which culminated in the year 1879. From that time until the year 1882 things began gradually to improve, and in the year 1882 we had reached a year that was certainly very much better than the three or four preceding years, and unfortunately, as it has since turned out, very much better than the subsequent years. The period during which I took part in fixing the judicial rents extended to the year 1884, and I will take the liberty of comparing the prices of the six preceding years ending with 1884. I find that the prices of the six previous years were considerably higher. Butter was 20 per cent higher; mutton 5 per cent; beef, 15 per cent; milch cows, 7 per cent; and two-year-old stock, 20 per cent. Now, in quoting percentages I would ask the House to notice that the percentage by no means conveys the effect on the profits of farming. The cost of production varies but little, and any change in prices falls mainly on the margin of profit. To explain clearly what I mean I will give an example. Suppose that the value of a particular article is £10, and the cost of producing that article is £5; if, by some means or other, a reduction in value of £2 10*s*. is brought about, the reduction on the margin of profit would not be 25 per cent, but 50 per cent. Now, Sir, I would ask what qualification a rent fixed for a period of years ought to possess? There can be no doubt that it ought not to be a rent which could be paid in a bad year. In that case it might be unfairly low for an average year, and decidedly too low for a good year. But, for the same reason, it ought not to be a rent which could only be paid in a good year; it ought to be a rent which the tenants could pay in an average year, and then, in an extra good year, they would be able to realize sufficient to carry them over a bad year. That is the only principle on which a fair rent could be fixed. We have been asked whether the Commissioners took into consideration the recommendations of the Bessborough Commission. My answer to that is this. The Bessborough Commission sat, I think, before the period of depression had ended; and the improvement of prices which has taken place since certainly made us look on matters in a different light. Now, Sir, were we, in fixing the rents, to ignore entirely the high prices which existed previously to the year 1879? I do not know on what basis we could do so. I do not know what the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer may think now as regards our duty in that particular; but I feel confident that if at that time he had held a brief for the landlords, and had appeared for them in one of our Courts, he would have urged upon us most strongly that we were bound to take into consideration that period of high prices in fixing a rent that was to last for 15 years. What were the rents that were fixed? We believed them at the time to be rents that could be fairly paid in an ordinary year. We believed that we had passed through the period of depression; and judging by past events—and, as far as I can see, that was the only substantial ground upon which we had to stand—we believed that the period of depression was over, and that before it returned there would be some decidedly good years. We believed that the worst was over, and we were strengthened by the fact that the year 1882 was a very much better year than the three preceding ones. But what has happened since? Have our expectations been verified? We have had one year that might be called an average year, but we have had several years below the average. We have had none—not one single year in which the tenant could save sufficient to carry him over a bad year. This state of things has been followed by a period of depression; so great that in our wildest dreams we never contemplated it. Now, I confess that I am totally ignorant of English agriculture—about as ignorant as some hon. Gentlemen opposite appear to be of Irish agriculture, and that, I think, is saying a good deal. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant said yesterday—speaking of that part of England with which he is personally acquainted—that large reductions in the rent had been necessary there in the year 1885 on account of the great fall in the price of wheat. Although I know nothing of the prices of English agriculture, I have been able to refer to the average price of wheat; and I find that, taking the price of wheat in the year 1885, and comparing it with the average price in the six previous years, there was a fall of 13 per cent. I by no means mean to say that that has not rendered a large reduction of rent necessary; but taking the price of the staple articles in that part of Ireland with which I am acquainted, and comparing the price of those articles in 1885 with the six previous years, what do I find? Not a fall of 13 per cent, as was the case in wheat in England, but a fall in butter of 20 per cent; in beef of 18 per cent; in mutton of 19 per cent; in milch cows of 18½ per cent; in two-year-olds of 42 per cent; and in yearling stock of 22 per cent. This, Sir, is the fall in prices which has taken place since the judicial rents were fixed, and yet the Chief Secretary for Ireland expresses a deliberate opinion that Irish farming has not been so very much affected by the fall of prices as English farming. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, no!] I certainly understood the right hon. Gentleman last night to acknowledge that the rents required reduction in the South of England, because of the fall in the price of wheat, and unless my memory is very faulty, the right hon. Gentleman expressed a decided opinion that the same did not apply to Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am sure the hon. Member has no desire to misrepresent what I stated. My remark was, that the fall in the price of wheat had had a great effect in the South of England, and that it had led to a reduction in rent. I did not make any further statement than that.

MR. MAHONY: I am glad to hear that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary does not maintain the opinion that the fall in agricultural produce in Ireland has not affected the question of judicial rents. I certainly thought that he did maintain that opinion, and I am delighted to hear that he does not. I think, Sir, I have shown by the account I have given of the considerations by which we were influenced when we fixed the judicial rents, and by the statement of the fall which has taken place in the prices of agricultural produce since those rents were fixed, that if they were fair at the time we fixed them they must most decidedly and certainly be unfair now. At any rate, I give that as my opinion, whatever that opinion may be worth; and it is an opinion upon which some thousands of the judicial rents have, to a very large extent, been based. It is certainly my opinion now, that the rents which for three years I took part in fixing, are at the present moment decidedly too high. I further give it as my deliberate opinion, from the knowledge I possess of a very large part of Ireland, that a majority of the tenant farmers in Ireland at the present moment are unable to pay the judicial rents. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) has quoted a high authority to show that the tenants' improvements have not been interfered with by the decision in the case of "Adams *v.* Dunseath;" but he omitted to mention that portion of the judgment which laid down that a tenant could be compensated for his improvements by the enjoyment of them. That is a doctrine which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) distinctly stated formed no part of the Act of 1881. In regard to the improvements, there is one other point to which I should like to direct the attention of the House. It would strike one as an ordinary matter of fairness, if we simply wished to arrive at a just decision between landlord and tenant, that, where it had been the custom for the tenant to make all the improvements, and the custom for the landlord to make none—in such cases, at any rate, the onus of proof should be thrown on the landlord. But, Sir, in any case the unfortunate tenant has to produce legal proof that the improvement has been made by him or his predecessors in title; and that fact alone has enabled the landlords, and has compelled the Land Court, to fix rent on the tenant's improvements. And now, Sir, I would like to say a word as regards those tenants who have not had judicial rents fixed. There are more things to be considered in reference to these persons than I think has yet been brought under the notice of the House. We have heard of the question of making applications to the Court. Hon. and right hon. Members do not seem to consider that the question of expense is any great bar to the tenants of Ireland; but in poor districts, such as some parts of Galway, Mayo, and Donegal, even a shilling fee, which is an absolutely necessary expense, is a matter of great importance. Besides, it is a well-known fact, to anyone who knows anything about the working of the Irish Land Act, that a tenant has little chance of pleading his case successfully unless he has legal assistance, which cannot be obtained for 1*s*. I am well acquainted with a large portion of Donegal. I know one district where I do not think a single tenant farmer would have been able to enter the Court, except for the energetic and charitable and patriotic action of the parish priest. I allude to Father McFadden, of Gweedore. And the system he adopted was this. On a small sum being guaranteed to him by the tenant, he undertook to bring the case before the Court, and to return to the tenant whatever amount he received from him in the event of failure to obtain a reduction. What was the result of the action of this gentleman? Why, on one estate which up to that time had been looked on as a model estate amongst the landlords the tenants got a reduction — I am speaking now from memory — of, I think, 37 per cent. That created a tremendous flutter amongst the landlords; the Chief Commissioners were immediately besieged on the subject, and they, most improperly, I think, did a thing which they did in no other case—namely, resolved to hold a special sitting, to decide at once whether these frightful reductions on this model estate were justified. Owing to some disagreement this special sitting did not come off; but these cases have since been re-heard by the Chief Commissioners, and the decisions have been confirmed. There is another point besides the expense that has acted as a great bar to many tenants availing themselves of the Land Act, especially the small tenants, and that is the question of the right of turbary. On many estates it has been the custom to give the tenants the privilege of cutting turf at a merely nominal figure. Well, some landlords, to my certain knowledge, have made use of their power over the right of turbary to prevent their tenants from going into the Court. They have warned their tenants that if they went into the Court they would have to look for turbary elsewhere. Other landlords, after the tenants have been into Court, and have obtained a reduction of their rent—and to the small tenants this has been a serious injury—have recouped themselves to the full amount of the reduction by increasing the sum charged for turbary. The same system and practice has been pursued with regard to other privileges usually accorded to the tenantry, such as mountain grazing. Here is another matter that the landlords use as a lever to prevent the tenants from going into the Court, and that is the hanging gale. It is the custom in many parts of Ireland not to ask for the payment of the rent that falls due in March or May until the following September or November. Many landlords, after the judicial rent has been fixed, have departed from this custom, and have forced the tenants to pay the new rent on the day on which it fell due. By refusing the old-established privilege of the hanging gale to their tenants holding under judicial rents, and by continuing to grant it, not only to those who hold under their old rents, but also to those who settled with their landlords out of Court, they have put a premium on settlements out of Court; and they have, in many cases, forced their tenants to agree to pay higher rents by arrangement out of Court than those tenants would have had to pay if they had gone into the Land Court. This, Sir, is the way in which the landlords have facilitated the carrying out of the Act on which Her Majesty's present Government take their stand. These are the tenants which the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant says have no grievance—I mean the tenants who do not hold under judicial rents — because, as the right hon. Gentleman says, they can apply to the Court to fix judicial rents, and can also apply to the Court to put a stay on eviction proceedings. Unless I am very much mistaken, in order to do these things the tenants must apply to two Courts; because the Court to which the landlord applies for power to evict is the County Court, and the Court the tenant applies to to fix a fair rent is the

Land Commission Court; and unless I am much mistaken they must apply first to the Land Commission Court to fix a fair rent, and then apply to the County Court Judge and ask him to put a stay on the proceedings for eviction. And suppose the tenants succeed before the County Court Judge, and get a stay on the proceedings, what advantage will they gain? They will be put on terms to pay a certain amount of rent, pending the settlement of a fair rent, and when that fair rent is fixed it will only take effect from the next gale day, and up to that very day they will have to pay the old rack-rent just the same as before, so that I fail to see what benefit the tenants will derive, even if a stay of proceedings is obtained. They will not be in a bit better position to pay the arrears. They will have to pay all the arrears at the same old rent. The Court has no power whatever to deal with that. Now, Sir, I should like to ask the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, how it happens that the Government have omitted to mention altogether what they intend to do as regards leaseholders? I think I am right in saying that no Member of Her Majesty's Government has given us even an inkling of what they intend to do with regard to leaseholders. Now, what is the position of leaseholders? Many of them took their leases in order to escape from the power of the landlords to raise the rent. That power became so intolerable that the Government stepped in and deprived the landlord of the power to raise the rent; and the very men who felt that power in the most bitter manner, and to whom it was so galling that in order to protect themselves they undertook to pay for a term of years a high rent, so that it might not be perpetually raised, are deprived of the benefit of the Act which the Government passed. If there is a case to be brought before the notice of the Government more weighty than another it certainly is the case of the leaseholders. Besides the ordinary case of the leaseholders, there is the case of those who have accepted leases since the Act of 1870—since the time when Parliament put a premium upon leases in Ireland. It has been proved, over and over again, that many landlords forced their tenants to take leases, and in order to meet that difficulty a clause was put in the Act of 1881 enabling the tenants who had been unjustly forced to take leases to break them. But the Chief Land Commissioner in Ireland, Judge O'Hagan, has stated that it would pass the wit of man to understand how, according to the interpretation of the Court of Appeal in Ireland, there could possibly be an unjust lease. So that that clause of the Act of 1881 has completely failed. Sir, the only hope of the amendment of the Act of 1881 which Her Majesty's Government has held out is the amendment of the Purchase Clauses. I should say by all means put the landlords in a position to come to an agreement with their tenants. Give the Courts more power to deal with head rents and head landlords like Trinity College; but see that the tenants are free to make their contracts too. The case to which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) referred looked to me rather as if the landlord, under the threat of eviction, or by some such power, had managed to make his tenants agree to terms which were unfairly high. Certainly, the Commissioners must have considered the terms unfairly high, or they would not have refused to sanction them. I am aware of some cases in which the landlords and tenants have come to terms as regards purchase, and the Chief Commissioners have sanctioned those terms; and in the same county, almost in the same district, they have refused to sanction the terms on which agreements, or so-called agreements, have been made, and I think they were right in doing so, because the amount one gentleman, at any rate, sought to charge the tenants was very much higher than any other landlord in the district was able to obtain. But the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland does not appear to think that the terms were unfairly high, because the Land Commission refused to sanction them; and he deliberately proposes to make such an alteration in the Act that extra security shall be given for repayment of the purchase money by the Local Bodies in distressed districts. I think that, before he has been very much longer in Office, he will discover that the Local Bodies in the distressed districts of the West of Ireland are not very well suited to the giving of security. I think he will find that he has difficulty enough in getting these Local Bodies to pay the rates, which will, undoubtedly, be very high, in consequence of the manner in which the distress in these districts has been dealt with. And now, Sir, Members of the Party to which I have the honour to belong have been accused of being ready to agree to the provision of 20 years' purchase in the Act introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian last Session. As well as I remember, I do not think that any Member of that Party expressed approval of the 20 years; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian has told us that the 20 years was no principle of the Bill. It was clearly an accidental provision, and the right place to discuss that provision would have been when the Bill got into Committee. If the Government are determined to take their stand on the Act of 1881, I would appeal to them to take their stand on the spirit of that Act, and not on the letter. We know that they are inclined to prefer the letter to the spirit. We know that they are inclined to grasp at the shadow and lose the substance; we know that they sit on those Benches because they prefer a dead and soulless piece of paper to a real and living union of hearts. They say they have the mandate of the constituencies for that; but I do not think they can claim any mandate for maintaining the letter of the Act of 1881 in such a manner as to kill the spirit. If they cannot make their Government agreeable to us, at any rate they can make it bearable as a temporary and necessary evil. But if, instead, they adhere to the policy which has been explained by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer—if they adhere to this policy of exciting the landlords to exact to the uttermost their legal rights, then, indeed, we have reason to be alarmed. We have been told there is no need to fear the state of things in November, because ejectments cannot be obtained until January. I should like to ask what right hon. Gentlemen opposite have to say about the September and November rents payable in March and May, and the March and May rents payable in September and November, for which ejectments have already been obtained? How are we to escape from them? Are the landlords to be trusted to exercise their rights with moderation? I was lately in a distressed district in the West of Ireland—in one of those special districts where the population were undoubtedly in danger of starvation unless proper means had been taken to give them assistance—and in that very district I saw enough to assure me how little the landlords are to be trusted. In the village of Muckenagh the inhabitants were turned out wholesale. A large force of Constabulary was present at the evictions, and a gentleman who saw every house in that village emptied of everything it contained did not see one single potato taken out and only a few handfuls of meal from some of them. The Constabulary were so affected by the whole scene that they emptied their knapsacks and gave the starving people all they had to eat. That is an example of the moderation practised by some landlords. The hon. Gentleman the Member for one of the Divisions of Queen's County has alluded to the ejectments that have taken place in the Gweedore district—a district quite as poor, I believe, as any of the distressed districts in Galway; and if landlords have acted in the past few months in that manner, what may we not expect from them under the direct encouragement given to them by the Government to exercise their legal rights to the utmost? But, Sir, if the Government think that they are going quietly to get rid of the people of Ireland I think they mistake the present attitude of the Irish people. They do not appreciate how much of the peaceful attitude of the Irish is due to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, in the name of the English people, extended to us the right hand of friendship. They do not appreciate the fact that we now have friends in this country, and that they are a strong, numerous, and united Party—united to one another and to us, not merely by a common opposition to one particular Bill, or, perhaps, it might be more accurately described, as a common opposition to one particular man, but by the broad platform of similar ideas and similar projects. What we want to do for the Irish Democracy according to Irish ideas, the Party with which we are joined in England want to do for the English Democracy according to English ideas; and they will not only join us in denouncing crime, but they will also join us in denouncing those outrages that are committed under the protection and in the name of the law.

MR. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Harrow): I do not wish to speak at great length on this Amendment; but I desire to congratulate the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) on the character in which he is appearing in connection with this proposal—figuring as he does before the taxpayers of England as their champion, because the latter part of the Amendment, I observe, deals not with the interests of the people of Ireland, not with the interests of the poor suffering people who, as indicated, are about to go through such a dreadful winter, but with the interests of the taxpayers of England. He says—

> "That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."

Well, I hope the hon. Gentleman will succeed in obtaining some little popularity from the taxpayers of England, because of the care and attention he is paying to their interests; but I trust the population of Ireland will observe that the hon. Member is prepared, from that point of view, to sacrifice their interests in the coming winter, because, so far, the only proposition which is before the House — or I should rather say not before the House, but which has been foreshadowed in the speech of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill)—was the suggestion that there should be a Royal Commission appointed for the purpose of inquiring whether or not judicial rents in Ireland are too high, and of considering what should be done in the matter. In truth, there was nothing before the House that could justify this condemnation which comes in his speech by anticipation. I cannot help thinking that we should look between the lines of this Amendment in order to ascertain the hon. Member's real purpose. You do not find it clearly expressed. Clearly it is not the point here mentioned, because there is no measure before the House proposing to tax the English taxpayers; and if there were, it is obvious it could not come on before next spring, whereas the difficulties pointed out in the Amendment are difficulties which would be experienced by the Irish tenants during the coming winter. Therefore, it is quite clear that that is not the object. It seems to me that the real object of this Amendment is to put on record a sort of grievance on behalf of the Irish tenants, and to foreshadow that which I have no doubt is in the power of the hon. Member and his followers to accomplish—namely, that if Her Majesty's Government do feel it their duty to enforce the law in protecting the officers of the law in carrying out necessary evictions there shall be social disorder, and those outrages which we are told will follow evictions. That seems to me to be the real indication contained in the hon. Member's speech. It would not have done for the hon. Member to have embodied in his Amendment a direct recommendation that evictions were to be suspended. First of all, there would be the answer that Her Majesty's Government would not feel it in their power to accept such a recommendation. Then it is quite clear that a Bill for that purpose could not be carried. But what does appear to be intended is to point out that as the consequence of evictions there will be outrages, hence we have the words—

> "Numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing wide-spread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result."

Not only the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, but the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) also seemed to think that it was important to point out to the House that outrages and evictions were in some way or other connected. Indeed, the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland gave us figures which I, for one, am not prepared to contest. Each of those three right hon. Gentlemen seems to think it was incumbent on him to point out that in proportion as there were evictions, so, also, there were outrages. I am not going to question the accuracy of the assumption; but what does that prove? No doubt evictions have been followed by outrages; but why? Because the outrages were intended to deter landlords from proceeding to eviction; and those who are opposed to evictions are determined to see that there shall be no evictions which shall not be followed by outrages. No doubt, in the warfare here indicated, evictions, as well as outrages, are the result of the conspiracy of the National League, or whatever it may be called, to resist the payment of rent; but if you have a conspiracy of the kind, what happens? If you have a conspiracy to resist the payment of rent the landlords are bound to appeal to the law, and those who administer the law are bound to carry out evictions by way of putting down the conspiracy. If we are to give up evictions merely because they are to be followed by outrages, it would be nothing else than a complete surrender to the National League. But I venture to think that Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to make any such surrender. I know that in this House the late Chief Secretary for Ireland announced such a policy as seems to be desired by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell)—namely, that evictions should be suspended. I was appalled to hear the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, that he was not prepared to use the forces of the Crown to enforce what he spoke of as the shadowy rights of the landlords. Sir, I submit that Her Majesty's Government have no choice in this matter, and the right hon. Gentleman himself seemed to modify his words when he found that the Government of which he was a Member thought he had gone a little too far. No Government has a right to refuse the assistance of the law to those who have the right to claim it; and I repeat that it would be a complete surrender if we were to give up these rights merely because evictions are to be followed by outrages. It is spoken of as if it was some very great hardship that there should be evictions for non-payment of rents. For my part, I fail altogether to see any hardship in it. We must bear in mind what is the position and nature of the present tenure of land in Ireland, as well as the present rights of the landlords. First, we have the fact that a large number of landlords in Ireland were purchasers under the authority of the Encumbered Estates Court; that many landlords paid a high price for land under a Parliamentary title, in the belief that such title was to be regarded as indefeasible. What happened? Under the Act of 1881 we have the rights of landlords considerably curtailed by the establishment of tenant right. Under that Act the Irish tenants who had no right in the land, except that given by yearly tenancy, acquired what is called tenant right. Whence have they acquired that right? It was at the expense of the landlords. Before that the landlord was the owner of the estate, and he was afterwards deprived of his right to the extent of the right of which the tenant is now possessed. The landlord, when that arrangement was made—which, by the way, was forced upon him by the Act—at all events received some consideration, because the tenant became part owner of the property, conditionally, upon the payment of rent; the tenant became a sort of copyholder of the land, just as in the case of a tenant in England who is subject to ground rent—that was the way he was spoken of, I think, by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. But one of the chief points in the contract made at the time was that, at all events, the rents should have some degree of permanency. So that the landlord, taking his chance of good and bad years, should have, at least, a settled and fixed income in consideration of the abatement from his rights which went to the tenant. I am not prepared to admit that there has been a fall in the price of produce—I take the statement that is made, however; and I ask, even if there has been a considerable fall, is it fair that under the circumstances the rights of the landlord should be further curtailed? I say it is not. And I ask whether, if there had been an advance in the price of produce, the tenant would pay a higher rent? I apprehend he would do nothing of the kind, and therefore the proposal is unfair to the landlords, because it is an attempt to deprive him of what is given him by the Act of 1881. It has been said that if the land does not produce the rent it cannot be paid by the tenant; but the very terms of the Act of 1881 were that the Commissioners, in fixing the rent, should take one year with another. That was one of the duties imposed on the Commissioners, and is it to be supposed that each tenant is, year by year, to be dependent upon the annual produce of his holding for the payment of his rent? It may be so in some cases; but there must be some tenants who have very considerable savings in the banks, and anyone who will refer to a statement of the late Prime Minister will see that it is so. Why, then, if they have been able to make a profit in successful years, should they not draw upon the savings' banks to pay the landlord his rent? I know of several instances, and I have been told of others by hon. Friends to-night, of men who, having refused to pay their rent on the plea of poverty, allowed the eviction to proceed and the Sheriff to take possession, but as soon as they saw that the landlord was in earnest put their hands in their pockets and paid the rents with the money that was kept there until necessity should arise. If, then, it be true in some cases, it is not true in all, that the tenants cannot pay. Supposing, then, that a tenant cannot pay his rent. I know of no law and no principle of morality or justice which can entitle a man to continue to retain possession of a piece of land held in consideration of the payment of rent, and which allows him neither to pay the rent nor give up the land. It seems to me that a man who cannot pay his rent has one duty to discharge, and that is to give up the land. It may be that if he cannot make the land pay someone else could. We cannot judge of the amount of rent to be paid by the result of the farming of an idle and incapable tenant; it is the result of the exertions of a good farmer which is the measure of the rent which should be paid. If I should hire a piano or furniture for a house on certain terms of payment, you would not say that I was entitled to keep possession of them if I could not keep up the payments; and therefore I say let the tenant give up the land, the rent of which he cannot pay, and the landlord would then have a chance of getting a tenant who could pay. The truth is that we have got into difficulty by interfering with the economic laws which regulate these matters. Parliament, in passing the Act of 1881, was led astray in the attempt to settle by law that which ought to have been left to be settled between the landlords and the tenants themselves. We have found by experience the truth of the statement of Earl Grey, who said that the economic laws had never been broken by any nation with impunity; and yet we are now asked to do what I hope the House will refuse to do—namely, further to infringe those laws.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir Thomas Esmonde.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Sir, the Government would not think of offering any opposition to the adjournment of the debate to-night; but I may take the opportunity to remind the House that this is the fourth night on which we have been engaged on the Address. It is clear to many hon. Members that this debate should not be unduly protracted; and I, therefore, venture to express the hope that it may be concluded on Thursday next.

MR. SEXTON (Sligo, S., and Belfast, W.): My recollection is that, in recent years, the debate on the Address has occupied 12 or 14 days, and that at times when there was much less ground of debate, and less pressing necessity in the interests of Ireland than there are on the present occasion. I do not understand that the debate upon the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) has been at all fully developed, inasmuch as there are other facts to be urged in support of that Amendment which will be well worthy of the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. I would also remind the noble Lord that there stands on the Notice Paper other Amendments to the Motion. I have given Notice of one with reference to the disturbances in Belfast, in moving which I shall have to call attention to the connection between those disturbances and the action of the noble Lord himself.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

—o—

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE. FIRST READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the evening it was suggested that it might be desirable, for the convenience of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that I should, in moving for leave to introduce the Bill of which I have given Notice, state its principal provisions. I am glad to say I can do so in a very words indeed. The House is aware that before it left Office the late Government issued a Commission, composed of Gentlemen whose names are known, to inquire as to the origin and the circumstances of the riots and disturbances that occurred at Belfast. Now, after the Commission had been issued, it was considered, in very many quarters, that its proceedings could hardly be of a satisfactory character unless it had the power conferred upon it of summoning witnesses and examining those witnesses on oath. That is a power which can only be conferred by the Legislature, and when the present Government came into Office the matter was taken by them into consideration. Having regard to the excitement which the riots and disturbances have caused in Belfast and its neighbourhood, and having regard to the serious issues that may be inquired into by the Commission, it is considered by the Government reasonable that these powers should be given by the Legislature. There is a precedent for the granting of these powers, and the Government have determined to follow it. The Bill which I ask leave to introduce is very short and simple; it empowers the Court to summon witnesses, to enforce the production of documents, and to examine the witnesses that are produced before it on oath. It, in fact, in one clause, which is the substantive portion of the Bill, confers on the Commission the powers which belong to the High Court of Justice, or to the Judges of that country, to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to examine them. Further, of course, it empowers the Commission to imprison for contempt, that being the sanction by virtue of which Judges can enforce the attendance of witnesses. As, however, the Commission will not possess the dignity of the High Court of Justice, we propose that the powers to imprison for contempt should be limited to the period of three months—that is in accordance with precedent. If false evidence is given, the person tendering it will, of course, be subject to penalty. These are the provisions of the Bill. In introducing this Bill we have no idea of entering upon really contentious legislation. It is said it is the desire of all Parties interested that these powers should be conferred on the Commission. We heard from the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Mr. John Morley) last night, in a speech on another subject, that he strongly approved of the measure as he understood it; and we understand it is the desire of hon. Members sitting in every quarter of the House that these powers should be given. We therefore propose a Bill for that purpose. I hope there will be no objection to it, but that it will be received in the spirit in which it is introduced.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for facilitating the proceedings of the Commissioners appointed to hold a Court of Inquiry respecting Riots and Disturbances at Belfast."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Mr. SEXTON (Sligo, S., and Belfast, W.): I can tell the right hon. and learned Gentleman that hon. Members from Ireland sitting in this part of the House have no thought of encountering this Bill in any factious spirit. We feel the necessity for prompt and searching inquiry into the lamentable occurrences in Belfast, and our honest desire is that the investigation shall be conducted under conditions as shall elicit the truth. Perhaps the right hon. and learned Gentleman has no objection to let us know whether the witnesses appearing before the Commission will be subject to examination and cross-examination by counsel representing the various parties interested?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): Yes, Sir; certainly.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): Before leave is given to introduce the Bill, I should like to point out that one provision, which would render the Bill a useful one, has been very singularly omitted, and that the Members of the Party to which I belong have no great confidence in the Commissioners who will be appointed to conduct the inquiry. One is a gentleman from Scotland, of whose character we know nothing whatever. We find that though the Commissioners will be entitled to issue *subpœnas*, there is no power to be given to any householder in Belfast to compel the issue of a *subpœna* to any person he may deem a material witness. It will, therefore, be in the power of the Commissioners to obtain the attendance of witnesses of such character and political colour as will please them, and we look forward with some degree of certainty to the course which will be adopted.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 35.]

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed:—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it:—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Sir CHARLES FORSTER, Mr. WILLIAM LOWTHER, Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, Mr. HUGH ELLIOT, Colonel BRIDGEMAN, Mr. DONALD CRAWFORD, Mr. MULHOLLAND, Viscount LYMINGTON, Mr. WIGGIN, Mr. RICHARD POWER, Mr. M'LAGAN, Mr. MORGAN HOWARD, Mr. HENRY TOLLEMACHE, Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR, and Mr. JAMES A. CAMPBELL.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

OPEN SPACES AND RECREATION GROUNDS (DUBLIN) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Murphy, Bill to provide for Open Spaces and Public Recreation Grounds in the City of Dublin, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Murphy, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Dwyer Gray, and Mr. Timothy Harrington.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 36.]

RAILWAY REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to make further provision for the safe working of Railways, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. A. Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Charles Parker, Mr. Jacoby, and Mr. Lawson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 37.]

BALLOT ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Waring, Bill to amend "The Ballot Act, 1872," *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Waring, Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Colonel Saunderson, and Mr. Baden-Powell.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 38.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 25*th August,* 1886.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Parliamentary Elections Law Amendment* [39].

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FIFTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [19th August.]—[See page 96.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words,—"And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) said that, notwithstanding all that had been said on the opposite

Benches during the course of the debate, he ventured to assert that the condition of the tenantry of Ireland was one which demanded immediate attention and immediate action on the part of Her Majesty's Government, whatever Her Majesty's Ministers might say to the contrary. The Irish Members were in a position to speak with somewhat of authority on that subject, and they deemed it their duty to lay before the country the extreme urgency of the question. Owing to the great depression or fall in the prices of agricultural produce, rents which were fixed two years ago, and which then might have been considered fair rents, could not now, in many cases, be possibly paid. It was a matter of public notoriety, notwithstanding the assertions made yesterday by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket), that those rents were fixed on the supposition that the price of agricultural produce had reached the lowest point; but since that time there had been a still further fall in agricultural produce, and the result was that those judicial rents, which might have been fair when they were fixed, were now certainly rack-rents, and impracticable. Her Majesty's Government had informed the country that they intended to uphold social order in Ireland; but if by the maintenance of social order they meant the maintenance of the assistance of the landlords in exacting rents from the tenants, which the land had not produced, the outlook for the peace of the country during the coming winter was dark in the extreme. Not only had agricultural produce fallen in value, but in many cases it was wholly unsaleable. In the county of Wexford, which was supposed to be one of the most prosperous districts in Ireland, he could state, as a fact, that the farmers had often brought their stock, or their grain, or their butter, to market, and had been unable to dispose of it at any price. If that was the state of things in the county Wexford, what must be the case in the Southern and Western districts of the country? And yet it was in the Southern and Western districts that the landlords were dealing most harshly towards their tenants, and were committing acts, such as those committed at Gweedore, which, if committed in any English county, would rouse a storm of indignation throughout the land. The result of these acts was to drive the people to seek shelter in the ditches, or in the workhouse—that demoralizing institution—or to drive them into the slums of great English cities, to swell the numbers of our already over-crowded labour market, or to drive them to America, where they joined the large body of inveterate and determined foes which injustice had raised against England. Were these results such as would commend themselves to the people of England, or to a Government which pretended to be actuated by the loftiest Constitutional principles? Her Majesty's Government were not justified in the reckless waste of public money which these evictions caused. Moreover, the economic and social results proceeding from them were sad in the extreme. They were therefore entitled to ask Her Majesty's Government what steps they intended to take to deal with the agrarian situation in Ireland? In many parts of the South and West the rents were not made out of the land, but were paid either from the wages of Irish harvestmen in England, or else by the illicit distillation of whisky. He did not think English artizans and labourers would uphold a system which tended to flood the English labour market with Irish labour. If evictions were permitted during the coming winter crime would result; and, although they might deplore the crimes, they could not absolve the Executive Government from the responsibility of allowing a state of things to exist from which such disorders arose. They had been told that they were preaching the "No Rent" doctrine, but they were doing nothing of the sort. They did not, by any means, deny to the Irish landlords their just share in what the soil had produced. So long as dual ownership in land prevailed, so long were the landlords entitled to their share in the produce, but only their fair share. The landlord had an indefeasible right to the rent, but only to a just rent. He had no moral right, whatever his legal right might be, to claim from his tenant a larger rent than the land produced. The landlord and tenant were joint owners in a common property—in a common concern—and if the working of that concern resulted in a profit, the landlord was entitled to a share in the profit; but if the profits diminished, the landlord could only claim a diminished share of the profit. If the working of the land produced a loss, then the landlord must bear his share of that loss. The proposal of the Government to appoint a Commission was not satisfactory, because the mischief would be done before any remedy would be applied. At any rate, the Irish Members had made their position clear in this matter. The question at issue was a pressing one for immediate action, and required a pressing and immediate remedy. If the landlords insisted upon rents which the land had not produced outrages would undoubtedly follow, and after the warning which the Government had received the blame could not be laid at the doors of the Irish Members. ["Hear, hear!"] If the Government intended coercion it would be more manly for them to declare their intention openly. Since the Irish Parliament was destroyed they had 86 Coercion Acts; and, speaking as an Irishman, he would say that no number of Coercion Acts would cause the Irish people to renounce or lose faith in their right to make their own laws. Indeed, the large number of Coercion Acts there had already only intensified the national feeling. If they did not insist on a policy of coercion, and desired to govern Ireland in a Constitutional manner, they would be wise to take the advice of the Irish Members, and stop indiscriminate evictions in Ireland, because of the non-payment of rents which the land would not produce. This advice was tendered the Government; and if they did not accept it, they must rank with those of whom Fielding has it—"That they are unable to gather wit or wisdom from anyone capable of lending them either." The Irish Representatives had done their duty to the country and to themselves, and if the Government chose to turn a deaf ear to their warnings they washed their hands of the responsibility.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) said, it was the duty of each Representative of the Irish people, one after another, to endorse emphatically the statements contained in the speech of the Leader of the Party to which he had the honour to belong. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) has struck the keynote of the situation when he stated that during the coming winter the people in many parts of Ireland would find themselves unable to pay their rents, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said they must pay, or allow the landlords to recover their property. In the coming winter it would be impossible for many of the tenants to pay their rents. There was no use in dealing with the question in a roundabout way. There was no use in discussing the question what would be the final settlement of the Land Question. They must address themselves to the immediate point. The one question upon which they should keep their attention was that if the landlords accepted the invitation of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), and that unless the landlords, either by law or by the private influence of the Government, or the influence of some people who had influence with them, were prevented from exacting, or attempting to exact, the rents that had been fixed by the Land Commissioners under the Land Act, the people would be evicted by thousands during the coming winter. What they had got to decide on at this moment, he thought, was whether the landlords were to be allowed to evict the people for rents which they could not pay. Were the people of England prepared to see Irish tenants, with their wives and families, cast upon the roadside? If there was a conspiracy against the payment of rents the case would be altered altogether; but there was no conspiracy against the payment of judicial rent, nor was there a single Member who sat near him who had encouraged the tenants to such a policy. Even when the "No Rent" Manifesto was issued the people, to a large extent, refused to avail themselves of it. The only conspiracy was on the part of the landlords, who would not accept such rent as the people were willing and able to pay. The difficulty would be reached next November. There was no use in appointing Commissions of Inquiry. The Land Question had already been sifted to the bottom. It had been inquired into and reported upon incessantly for the last 50 years. The Commission would not make its Report till next spring, whereas the tenants must pay in November or be evicted from their holdings. The Commission was a mockery to the Irish people, and would only serve to inflame their passions and increase their belief that the noble Lord and his Government did not really want to save the people from their landlords, but desired the landlords to go ahead in their evictions, and thereby cause outrage in order to furnish the Government with a pretext for introducing a Coercion Bill next year. The proposal of the Government was idiotic, and could only have proceeded from a stripling statesman, who was but a sorry substitute for the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. The noble Lord had told the landlords in effect that the Government would offer no obstacle to wholesale eviction; and there was nothing in the history of the landlords which encouraged a hope that they would not exact their pound of flesh, as they had done in the past, and especially at the time of the famine. This was not a matter which would brook delay. Immediate action was necessary, as the dark shadow was already athwart the country. In fact, the evil had already begun. In an evening paper yesterday there was an account of the arrival at the New Ross Workhouse of 62 persons, the wives and families of 13 evicted tenants on the Marquess of Ely's estate in Wexford. Then it was suggested that the tenants should pay their full rents out of the savings of former years. A more unjust or merciless proposal he never heard. The truth was that these supposed savings of the Irish farmers were, for the most part, entirely mythical. The county of Wexford was one of the most prosperous in Ireland, and was absolutely free from outrage. But even there the farmers were not able to pay their rents, though in numberless cases they had in the past paid them out of the remittances sent by their kindred in America and Australia. The last Christmas Return from the United States showed that no less than 8,000,000 dollars had been sent to Ireland in this way, every penny of which had gone to the landlords. There were no means of raising money to which the wretched tenants would not resort rather than face the bitter necessity of leaving their homesteads. The hon. Member for Cork had made the most practical suggestion—namely, that the rents should be revised every three years instead of every 15, in accordance with the variation in prices. If that suggestion were not adopted, and if the landlords refused to accept what the people could pay, there would be such an outbreak in Ireland as had not been known for many a long year. The people had been extraordinarily quiet under great provocation; but unless the Government did something they would become desperate. If evictions should be made wholesale and the people driven to fight in defence of their homesteads, there could be no mistake as to who were the originators of so great a calamity, and the people of England would not fail to lay the blame on the heads of a Government which, in so great a crisis, had nothing better to offer than the appointment of a Commission whose Report would be too late to deal with the evil of which it purported to be a remedy. The Irish Representatives had done their duty by giving the Government timely warning; and when the hands of the Government were stained with the blood of the Irish people, they could call the world to witness that they were innocent.

Mr. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) said, he thought the moderate tone of the speech of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) was better suited to the occasion than the inflammatory rhetoric to which the House had just listened. In the speech of the hon. Member for Cork there seemed to be more feeling and more reality than in the speech delivered by a distinguished statesman above the Gangway on the same side of the House—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt)—in whose every sentence was discernible the actor who was willing to take any part in the play in order to make certain of his filling a position on the stage. The hon. Member for Cork had raised a real issue by the Amendment which he had placed upon the Paper. The Irish problem consisted of two factors—the agrarian and the political—and the hon. Member and his Friends had, with great ingenuity and persistence, striven to connect the two inseparably. The connection of these two factors was a question of life and death to hon. Members below the Gangway opposite. It was to them a question of life and death that the agrarian difficulty should not be solved until the political difficulty should have been settled to their taste. It was, therefore, not a matter for surprise that speech after speech should be delivered by hon. Members opposite with the same object as that of the addresses which for months past had been heard on the hill-sides of Ireland. It was not surprising, he maintained, that inflammatory speeches should be made, having for their purpose the prevention, at all hazards, of the solution of the agrarian difficulty. The Party to which he belonged took a different view; they did not hold that the agrarian difficulty could not be dealt with separately from the political difficulty. The hon. Member for Cork, in his argument in support of the contrary view, had said that the Irish people would not surrender their birthright — namely, national independence—for the mess of pottage which the Government offered to them; but this mess of pottage to which the hon. Member referred meant nothing less than the prosperity and happiness of his country. There were two distinct aspects to the agrarian problem in Ireland. The aspect of the difficulty in the extreme West was different from that prevailing in the other Provinces. In the West the difficulty was perpetual in its character, the reason being the congestion of the population. The people there could not, and never had, paid their rents out of their earnings derived from agriculture. Their rents had been paid, to a large extent, out of the wages earned by the peasants who came to this country in the autumn to assist in the harvest work. Although the seaboard of the Western counties afforded opportunities for the successful pursuit of the fishing industry, the people had but little knowledge of the occupation, and could not practise it in such a way as to make it even moderately remunerative. When all the conditions of the problem were considered, it was impossible to believe that it could be solved, except by reducing the congestion of the district by the removal of many of the inhabitants. In the rest of Ireland the present condition of agriculture was, no doubt, such as rendered the payment of rents exceedingly difficult in certain cases. Much the same state of things existed in England, with this remarkable exception—that greater advantages were derived from the peculiar agriculture of Ireland than from the agriculture of England. The grazing products of Ireland had had a very much better market than the agricultural produce of our arable land in England. But, granting that the Irish farmers sometimes found it difficult to meet the demands of their landlords, the disease was a natural one to which a natural remedy ought to be applied. The rent ought to rise and fall with the rise and fall of the price of produce; but that natural remedy had deen displaced by the inversion of the laws of political economy, for which the country had to thank right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench. It seemed to him now, as in 1881, when it was proposed to introduce sumptuary laws on a gigantic scale, that a difficulty was imported into the problem which was absolutely certain to become a Nemesis. They were now shaking hands with Nemesis, and it was because they were doing so that they felt considerably stirred when they found the attitude of right hon. Gentlemen opposite to be that of cynics on this occasion. The difficulty was that the English Government had approached a very small part of the community, who were constituted the life-tenants of the land in Ireland, and said to them that, in view of the dangers of their position, they insisted by legislation that those life-tenants should be fined to the extent of 25 per cent of their incomes. The Government did not distribute the fine among all the partners who had an interest in the property—upon legatees and mortgagees—but imposed the whole burden on the tenant for life, and said—"We call upon you to make this sacrifice for the sake of peace and of the prosperity of the country; and, at the same time, we hold out to you this boon—that, having fixed the rent judicially and by the authority of Parliament, you may depend upon receiving it regularly for many years to come." When that offer had been made and embodied in an Act of Parliament, it seemed to him an exceedingly difficult thing for Parliament to restrain its hand when these same men came before it and said that the rents which were guaranteed by statutory title were no longer paid—not very often or very largely because they could not be paid, but because those who ought to pay them were being incited not to pay them; and because if they paid them they would be postponing that time which was longed for by hon. Gentlemen opposite when the Irish tenants should obtain what they called their independence. That was the motive which was being put before the peasants and farmers in all directions. Under these very awkward conditions he held that hon. Gentlemen opposite, no less than those on his own side of the House, were bound in equity to take care that the landlords should not suffer; and, therefore, he approved the proposal that a diligent inquiry should be made to ascertain in what cases there was a reasonable and in what cases an unreasonable opposition to the payment of rent. In any case, if Parliament, avowedly for the peace or benefit of the community, imposed a fresh fine by way of a compulsory reduction in rent on an individual or a class, he felt bound to say that that fine should be distributed among them all; and he would remind the hon. Member for Northampton, whose speech he otherwise largely approved, that he misunderstood the chivalrous instincts of the artizans whom he (Mr. Howorth) claimed to know very intimately in Lancashire, if he supposed that they were not willing to share such burdens when equitably laid for a national purpose.. Under any circumstances, there would be a permanent difficulty to meet in Ireland—namely, that barriers could only be temporarily raised against the laws of political economy, and that when those barriers were removed there would be precisely the same difficulties to meet which had to be met in 1881. There would still be a large number of men competing for farms, and so long as those men elected to remain on land upon which they could not live prosperously and well, so long would there be a permanent agrarian difficulty in Ireland. In his opinion, the only permanent remedy for this state of things was the remedy to be found in emigration. There was, perhaps, another alternative, and one which commended itself to hon. Members opposite. It was, no doubt, quite possible, as had been urged by the hon. Member for Cork, to keep these people at home by protecting the national products of Ireland against everybody, even against England. But he doubted if such a remedy would be satisfactory to the bulk of hon. Members opposite, and it seemed to him at least to be a very remote remedy. In conclusion, he begged to thank hon. Members for the patience with which they had listened to him when addressing the House for the first time.

Mr. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said, that although the House had been called together to vote Supplies, the discussion of grievances and remedial measures usually accompanied the voting of Supplies; but the Government, though they had nothing to propose themselves, seemed determined that private Members should not propose any remedial measures, and so deprived them of the Constitutional right of stating their grievances before Supply was granted. In fact, the Government had undertaken quite a new *rôle*, and had constituted themselves a universal blockading Party. In his opinion, the Cabinet should either be prepared to bring in remedial measures themselves for the relief of Irish wrongs, or, at least, show that their intentions were virtuous by not obstructing private Members who desired to make an attempt at accomplishing that in which the Government had failed. The suggestion that the Irish difficulty could only be met by further depopulation seemed to him to be deserving of the severest reprobation of the House. He would point out, not that it was necessary, because every impartial person admitted the existence of Irish wrongs, that in effect the state of things in the Sister Country was that within the last 30 years the population had diminished by nearly 2,000,000 of people, whilst, at the same time, the relative pauperism of the country had more than doubled. This was the country which was accused of shamming their inability to pay rent by keeping back their savings. It therefore seemed to him that the removal of the population by emigration, instead of increasing the prosperity of Ireland, had diminished it. He, with other political economists, did not believe that the prosperity or wealth of a country was increased by depopulation. The proposals of the Government—if, indeed, they could be dignified by the name of proposals—were that certain Commissions should be issued to report on the condition of things in Ireland. Of course, the Government were best acquainted with the condition of their own minds, and how far they themselves were possessed of information with regard to Ireland. Royal Commissions necessarily caused delay, and he was, on principle, opposed to them. In this particular case the Reports of the Commissions would in all probability be brought into the House long after the events with which they dealt had passed away. He was unwilling to impute the criminal motive of delay to the Government in the proposed scheme of multifarious Commissions of Inquiry. Yet he had to say that the hinted-at procedure certainly would generally be thought to be of such a character. The Tories, as a Party, were strong on the question of political economy; they constantly obtruded their acquaintance with philosophic economics. But it struck him that the economical character which they wished to be credited with existed chiefly in phrase, and not in concrete. He had found on looking back that Toryism had repudiated, or, at least, had not acted on, the principle of orthodox economics, from Adam Smith down to contemporary economists. Rather had they taken advantage of what was false and exploded in Mill, and of what was Socialistic in writers like Jevons and Cairnes when the borrowed matter was favourable to their privileges. Tories should not talk of scientific economics. The matter before the House was not one of economic fads, nor of economic mechanics. He regarded a man as anything but a machine. They wanted to improve the state of things which existed, and had long continued to exist, in Ireland, and which menaced the peace of the country and harassed ourselves. The Government had forgotten that some measures, at least, of relief should have been suggested. He believed that the Government had made a mistake when it did not fall in with the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), who had recommended not only the justice, but the expediency of at least some preventive measures to sterilize the crop of crime which would surely be born of unjust and heartless eviction. He knew little about evictions himself, and he was sure the English people knew as little as he. He, however, had seen localities where eviction had occurred, and he was satisfied from the horrible impressions which had been made on him that the English people—the working men—if they were better informed would not tolerate the existence of such a system. Facts and figures were the only arguments—slow, but sure, however—by which the eviction system could be exposed. From 1847 until 1851 he found that the number of families evicted in Ireland were 263,000. Those re-admitted as caretakers amounted to 73,000, so that there were about 190,000 families evicted during four years. Mr. Mulhall, the statistician, had calculated that during a period of 33 years there had been evicted 2,412,000 persons—that was to say, over 70,000 persons per annum. This was appalling; it was dreadful—it was a horrible state of things for the people of this country to contemplate. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth) that the hard-working men of this country would be prepared to pay something out of their own pockets, if the money went for the relief of the people in the distressed districts; but what they objected to was that the money paid by the tax-payers should go where it had gone before—namely, into the pockets of the landlords. It could hardly be believed, but it was a fact, that during the last seven years he found that the number of civil bill ejectments served in Ireland amounted to 116,818. Some of the ejected, doubtless, had been replaced as caretakers; but what a condition of dependent misery was that. Whilst he did not wish to harass the Government in carrying on the rule of Ireland, he wished to state that he believed his support was due to the Irish Party when he saw the duties of Office shirked, or, at best, foolishly performed by them. He should urge on the Government the absolute necessity of taking steps to ease the coming winter for the Irish tenants if they would do nothing more, so that evictions, and with evictions crime, should be stopped in that long-oppressed and unfortunate country.

Mr. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne) said, that the two last speakers had claimed to speak on behalf of working men. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth) had stated that the working men were prepared to bear a national fine in favour of the landlords in Ireland, and the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Howell) had said that the working men would be content to bear a national fine on behalf of the Irish tenants. He himself claimed to represent a working class constituency, and the working men of that constituency; and he wished to say that his constituents objected to pay one shilling of English taxation for the relief either of the landlords or the tenants of Ireland. With the working men, and also with the classes in his constituency, no measure would be so unpopular as that which would saddle the taxation of this country, or any of the industries of this country, with any charge whatever for the relief of landlords in Ireland. The Land Act of 1881, although it provided for the fixing of judicial rent, said not a single word about an Imperial guarantee for judicial or other rents; and if the landlords could not get their rents—and he hoped they would—they would but be in the same position as the unhappy manufacturers in Lancashire and in the North, who, when they could not get their money, were obliged to go without or do with less, and put up with the consequences. Nothing could be more distressing than evictions; but they occurred in England as well as in Ireland. It was not pleasant to contemplate a distress for rent or an execution for debt; but still the law was enforced in England against debtors. He should like to know what was proposed to be done in Ireland hereafter when a man wished to remove others from his land? People had to be evicted by others beside landlords. When the members of a family increased in number beyond the power of the land to afford them a living, the person who was in possession must evict the others; and all the troubles and miseries of eviction must, therefore, exist under any other system of law. The people who could not live on the land must go elsewhere, and if they could not find work in Ireland they must do what hon. Members opposite very much disliked—namely, emigrate. The best way for either a landlord or a tenant to get on in this world was by practising industry, hard work, and sobriety, and, above all, by the absence of political agitation. While he regretted evictions in Ireland, he believed there was nothing which this House could do that would really ease the tenants very much. One thing he hoped never would be done, and that was to assist either landlords or tenants by the money of the hard-working British taxpayer.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) said, he was anxious to join his voice to that of the Irish Party in expressing his belief in the total and absolute inadequacy of the Government proposals to meet the political and social crisis in which we were environed. He must state his satisfaction at the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), because the most industrious and ingenious critic would be unable to find, however energetic his search, any amelioration for the grievance which the Amendment embodied. The policy of the Government was a policy of somnolency, mischievousness, and inadequacy. It would passively permit landlord privileges, which, if unacknowledged, would be sanctioned by coercion, whilst no guarantee for the security of the Irish tenantry was offered. This mischievous and evil policy of delay, which made the tenant, where his own interests were concerned, the centre of remedial inaction, was most suited to the atmosphere of "Sleepy Hollow" than to the age of motion in which we lived. A Cabinet of "Rip Van Winkles" had satisfied their cravings of over-exerted duty, by fancying that they could retire to sleep for six months, and find out, at their awakening, all difficulties smoothed and dangers overcome. That was an unexaggerated description, in his opinion, of the policy of the Government; but he was inclined to imagine that the probability would be that the Ministerial slumbers should be disturbed by exciting and spectral dreams. The political intentions of the Government had been well characterized as a universal examination and inquiry bureau. The scheme of Commissions he considered a device not above the inventive faculty of a nation in a state of anarchy, and of about the mental *status* of a primitive community. The Irish people were starving owing to inexorable economic circumstances, in addition to the effects of political mismanagement. Eviction was stalking through the land with the but too willing "crowbar brigade" in the rear; and yet the Government proposed to consider the ways and means of remedy months hence. The Commission would not bring immediate relief to the tenant farmers of Ireland, and it was exactly the need of immediate relief in which the Irish farmers stood. Besides, Royal Commissions and Committees, they believed, would effect no good. Committees of this House and Royal Commissions had been shown, by the testimony of history in regard to Irish affairs, to resemble very much barren orchards. The trees might flower; but they would never bear any fruit. The evidence obtained by Committees, and Reports which had been presented by them to the House, would be worthless and valueless so far as relief was concerned. They were the acknowledgment of the debt which the English people and the English Parliament owed to the Irish people; but beyond these acknowledgments the English Parliament never got, and the Irish tenant farmer—in spite of these Reports—never reaped any substantial benefit. The Reports of these Commissions were, in fact, as valueless as the I.O.U's. of Mr. Micawber. There was no necessity for appointing any Commission, because the Government had evidence amply sufficient to go upon, if they wished to do anything for the immediate benefit of the tenant farmers and the artizan classes of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in the mild and generous speech he made the other night, told them that the reason the House of Commons had never given any effect to the Reports of those Committees was that they were invariably composed of Irishmen in sympathy with the Irish tenant farmers and the artizan classes, and the British Parliament naturally hesitated to spend millions of money in giving effect to those Reports. Why was the Devon Commission of 1845 comprised of men who sympathized with the Irish peasantry? The Devon Commission was composed of Irish landlords. That Commission held an inquiry extending over two years, during which time it received a large amount of valuable information. In its Report the Commission indicated the lines along which agrarian legislation should proceed; but Parliament never gave any effect to these recommendations until 1871, when the intensity of the Fenian movement compelled Parliament to direct its attention to the Irish agrarian difficulty. Did the Government, in appointing the various Commissions foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne, wish the same educational force to be applied again, in order to teach them that the long dreary chapter of agrarian injustice in Ireland was not yet closed? The teachings of Irish history and the record of the relations which had subsisted between the Parliament of this country and the Irish people had shown that Commissions and Committees in reference to Irish matters were shams and frauds. The records of those relations were as thickly strewn as the Atlantic was with the wrecks of noble vessels. In these circumstances, he believed that this system of inquiry by Royal Commissions would fail to bring any benefit either to the Irish people or to the tenant farmers of the country. What was needed at the present time was what was pointed out in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. Ireland called for something more immediate, more courageous, and more definite, and for a more sustaining course of policy than could be supplied by Commissions of this House, be they Royal or otherwise. They demanded intelligent attention. At the present there were two facts staring them in the face. In the first place, the land of Ireland could not at present pay the burden of rent imposed upon it; and, as a necessary sequence of that fact, evictions throughout the country were daily increasing. The Government might deny these premises—the English Government always did deny there was any exceptional distress in Ireland until the whole world recognized it, and then they were shamed into some acknowledgment of the fact that distress prevailed in Ireland. As it has been in former times, so it was to-day. This remark applied to the crisis of 1879, but more particularly to the famine of 1847. On the eve of the potato famine of 1847, the Duke of Richmond denied the statements then made as to the destitution; but the Duke of Richmond recognized no one as a man of responsibility unless he was a Duke or a Member of Her Majesty's Government. Lord George Bentinck had also said that the potato famine was a great delusion. Lord Stanley, the father of the noble Lord who speaks on behalf of England in "another place," denied its existence, and declared later that the famine in Ireland was a baseless vision. But quickly enough following these declarations all the horrors of the famine were seen, for, as a matter of fact, people were literally dying of starvation by hundreds on the roadside. It seemed to him that there was a strong family likeness between the utterances of the nobleman he had just cited and those which came from the mouthpiece of the Government on Thursday. "Her Majesty's Government," said that mouthpiece, "are by no means satisfied that there is any serious foundation for any one of these allegations" regarding the inability of the tenants to pay rent. No evidence in support of that assertion had been adduced by the Government; but on the other side they had abundant evidence to show that the tenants, owing to the fall in the price of agricultural produce, could not meet their legal obligations. *Thom's Almanac* for 1886 gave an estimate of the gross value of the principal crops which Ireland produced. It showed for a period of seven years the average prices which had been obtained by the 10 principal agricultural products—wheat, oats, barley, rye, peas and beans, flax, turnips, mangold-wurzel, beetroot, and hay. From 1878 to 1884 wheat fell from £1,153,000 to £495,000; oats fell from £7,617,000 to £7,243,000; barley fell from £1,567,000 to £1,070,000; rye fell from £57,000 to £29,000; peas and beans fell from £98,000 to £81,000; flax fell from £1,419,000 to £1,002,000; turnips fell from £2,811,000 to £2,104,000; mangold-wurzel from £514,000 to £329,000. In 1874 there was comparative wealth in the country; in 1884 there was comparative poverty. In spite of those facts, they still found Ministers rising in their place to declare that it was only in the matter of butter that the prices of agricultural produce had fallen in Ireland. Nothing had increased in value in the last seven years, according to *Thom*, except the staple commodity, potatoes, in regard to which there had been a considerable rise from 1878 to 1884; but that did not justify the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that nothing had fallen in price except butter. The agriculturist was in the same position that he was a few years ago. Agricultural depression prevailed to a large extent not in Ireland alone, but in England and Scotland as well. They had evidence of that in the substantial reductions that had been made in England and Scotland by the landlords to the tenant farmers. They had the declarations also made by Gentlemen who sat on the Nationalist Benches that the agricultural condition of Ireland is not what it once was. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh at that statement or refuse to accept it; but he said, in good faith, that there were Gentlemen sitting upon those Benches who had a more thorough and intimate knowledge of the agricultural situation in Ireland than any other Gentlemen in that House. They were of the agricultural class themselves; they had to make their own livelihood by the agriculture of Ireland, notwithstanding the sneer thrown across the floor of the House that these Gentlemen lived on the contributions of the servant girls of America. He knew the difficulty many of them had to live out of the produce of the agriculture of Ireland, and they were in a position to guarantee that the agricultural depression was not a myth, but a hard, severe, and sad reality. He must also call the attention of the House to the acknowledgment made by Sir James Caird. If all these declarations were not enough, surely the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be prepared to accept the declaration of one of his meekest and most docile associates—a Gentleman now sitting silently at his feet, drinking in lessons of political morality, strategy, and wisdom—a Gentleman who was of enormous use to the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the last Election—a Gentleman, in fact, whose services were so invaluable to the noble Lord, that the noble Lord owed his present position as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons to his indefatigable exertions—he referred to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). He would say to his British Radical Friends below the Gangway—"These be your Gods, oh Israel!" The right hon. Member for West Birmingham frequently spoke in two voices. He preferred to take the voice which sounded last April, rather than the voice that would probably sound on the floor of the House tomorrow night. In April last Mr. Chamberlain said—

> "But we are in the midst of a great and remarkable change in the value of agricultural produce. I am told that this value has fallen in Ireland since the Land Act from 20 to 40 per cent."—(3 *Hansard*, [304] 1821).

And, after pointing out that rents, which might be fair rents at that time, had now practically become rack-rents, he committed himself to this statement as a solution of the case. "I would," he said, " bring in a Bill to stay all evictions for a period of six months." The right hon. Gentleman, in other speeches, also said that there would be no necessity for resorting to repressive measures if they put the cause, in the shape of rack-renting, out of the way. Now, would the noble Member of the Government, who looked to the assistance of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham with such confidence, accept the advice of the right hon. Gentleman, and bring in a Bill to stay evictions for a period of six months, or would the right hon. Gentleman commit himself to a policy that would result in the passing of a Bill for staying immediate evictions in Ireland for a period of six months? He (Mr. Crilly) and other hon. Gentlemen would watch with some curiosity to-morrow night to see what action on this question of the staying of evictions the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham would take up. Besides the evidence they had that tenant farmers were unable to pay their rents, they saw that the landlords were ruthlessly proceeding with evictions in Ireland. The noble Lord the Leader of the House had some time ago, speaking to the Orangemen of Belfast, broken into poetry, and told the landlords to "charge with all their chivalry," and the dead which strewed the streets of Belfast attested how well the Orangemen had responded to his appeal. Now, the noble Lord was making an appeal, in antagonism to the popular forces in Ireland, to the landlords to "charge with all their chivalry," and the landlords were responding to that appeal no less nobly than the Orangemen in the streets of Belfast. They might take any paper published in any part of Ireland, and they would find that the landlords, feeling confident they could rely on the Government to back them, were resorting one more to the same old course of eviction, which had been followed by so much disaster and woe in times past. Lord Kenmare, who had to be guarded by so many constables, was responsible in Ireland for the eviction of 300 families; and when 300 men were thrown out on the roadside without shelter for their wives and children, was it likely that these men would be as cool and calm as hon. Gentlemen on the Government Benches? Was it wonderful that the man who did this should find it necessary to appeal for protection to the Government of the country? There were hon. Gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House who set an example as landlords which would compare very favourably with such men as Lord Kenmare. The same policy prevailed in the West of Ireland. At Woodford a man had been evicted because he owed £16 10*s*. The result had been that 27 prisoners had been taken to gaol, at a cost of £16 16*s*. The Resident Magistrate and the police present at the scene offered to subscribe among themselves the sum of £16 10*s*. due for rent to keep this unfortunate man in his home; but the agent of the property had refused point-blank to accept it, and insisted upon the man being turned out, because there were costs amounting to £17 10*s*. Was it wonderful, then, that they on those Benches should say that Shylocks were not confined to Venice alone? The whole of the rent owing on two estates in the neighbourhood of Galway, near where this man had been evicted, was £60, and to collect that rent in the present way of proceeding would cost over £1,000. Possibly the agrarian difficulty would not have been so intensified had they followed the example set by some of the landlords of the North of Ireland. He would instance that, at a recent meeting of the Listowel Board of Guardians, 40 eviction papers were laid on the table, dealing with the properties for which a gentleman by the name of Sands was agent. The people of Ireland—the tenant farmers of Ireland—came to that House and asked for bread, and the Government gave them a Royal Commission. The Government were pursuing the same old policy — they were protecting the landlord and deserting the tenant. Did hon. Members know what evictions were like? If they did, and if they had any humanity in their hearts, they would at once and spontaneously vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. As Representatives of the Irish people, they had a right to protest as strongly as they could against the policy of the Government, which was one which must ultimately lead to the imposition upon Ireland of a ruthless and heartless Coercion Bill. Instead of appealing to the people themselves, or to their Representatives, the Government appealed for advice to Gentlemen like the right hon. and gallant Member who had moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Was that Gentleman fitted to give an impartial account of the relations between the landlords and tenants of Ireland? That right hon. and gallant Gentleman was a political turncoat, having formerly been a Home Ruler; and he was also a convicted rack-renter, as shown by the records of the Land Court. In one case his rent was reduced from £90 to £70; in another from £81 to £77, and, on appeal, to £67. In 10 cases on the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's property at Ballymahon, which were brought before the Land Court by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, the rents had been reduced from £510 to £460, a considerable slice taken off; but the misfortunes of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman did not end in the Sub-Commissioners' Court, for the Head Commissioners, on being appealed to, further reduced it to £414. This Gentleman might be taken as a fair type of many of the landlords in Ireland. It was impossible that the Government should refuse to listen to the Representatives of five-sixths of the Irish people in the policy they wished the Government to adopt, and accept the advice of a landlord who in the Land Commission Courts had been proved to have been for years in the receipt of rack-rents to which no moral law gave him a right or title. The Government might as well expect to get a fair Report on the Belfast riots from a Royal Commission composed of the Rev. Mr. Kane, the Rev. Dr. Hanna, Mr. Haslett, a late Representative of a Division of Belfast in that House, and the Mayor of Belfast. The policy the Government were pursuing was a policy that would inevitably lead them to coercion, and it was a policy which was advised by such right hon. Gentlemen as he had described, to whom the Government had listened, while they had closed their ears to the representations made in the House by the Representatives of the Irish people. The reason why the policy of the Government would tend in the direction of coercion was that as evictions increased crime and outrage would increase. Like the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, he (Mr. Crilly) admitted that evictions were no justification for outrage and crime; but they could not get over the fact that there was a certain amount of human nature and human passions in those men who were ejected from their little homesteads, and that the ruthless eviction of tenants increased crime and outrage. But perhaps the explanation of the delay of six months which the Government asked for was that they wanted to come before the House with a positive and definite policy, which they had not got now. If they could come back in February with an increased record of crime and outrage during the winter months they could demand from the House of Commons those necessary repressive measures which the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke of as necessary to give to put down crime and outrage. The noble Lord said that, with the exception of Kerry, the records of crime in Ireland did not differ from what they were in the early part of the year. Why did not crime and outrage increase during the interval between the early part of the year and the present time? It was because the late Government refused to give its sanction and influence to the landlords of Ireland to promote evictions, because it was recognized that they felt in their English human hearts some sympathy with the Irish people, and because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) introduced proposals into that House which disarmed the resentment of the Irish people, and brought the Irish people into closer contact with the English people—and made their hearts warm to the English people—than ever they were before. He told the Members of Her Majesty's Government, as had been told to them already in the course of the discussion, that this policy of coercion would fail to drive out of the hearts of the Irish people those deathless aspirations for legislative independence which at present animated their hearts. It might be said on the other side of the House that National independence—a phrase which had been so frequently quoted in the House—implied total and absolute separation from England. To his mind, honestly speaking, it implied nothing of the kind. It meant that English domination in Ireland should be broken down—not that the influence of England in Ireland as the governing country should be lessened, but that it should cease entirely so far as it was able to direct the social and internal life of the Irish people. It was in that sense that they wished to put an end to English domination in Ireland—it was in that sense that they appealed to England for a measure such as that proposed by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian; and he told the noble Lord the Leader of the Government, who had shown in his political career that he had the capacity to learn something, that, though young and able as he was, he would never live to see the Irish National demand broken down, and that if he desired, as he ought to desire, to bring peace and prosperity and happiness to Ireland, and to the hearts and homes of the Irish people, it could not be done through the channel of coercion—it could only be done by recognizing the National sentiment and aspirations in the direction of Home Rule, and giving effect to the plea of the Irish people in the direction in which the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian would have given to them last Session. In conclusion, he would only say that if the Government desired to govern Ireland well and wisely and with justice, he would recommend them to study the words of a brilliant historian—an Irishman; and also, though he had taken the side of the Government lately, he would recommend to them for their approval the words of Mr. Lecky when he said—

> "In no other history but that of Ireland can we investigate more fully the natural consequences which must ensue from disregarding that sentiment of nationality which—whether it be wise or foolish, whether it be desirable or the reverse—is at least one of the strongest and most enduring of the human passions."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR (Leeds, Central) said, his hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth) bestowed great praise on the speech of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) for its moderation, and certainly the speech was marked by the hon. Member's characteristic moderation in tone. He imagined that the tone was intended for the benefit of the Imperial Parliament. The substance of the speech, however, was not quite so conciliatory; and that, he supposed, was intended for the consumption of the delegates at the Chicago Convention. He could not be sorry that the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) had shown his hand so openly, or regret that he had frankly called them behind the scenes, because it was exceedingly desirable that the House and the country should understand what was the real motive of the Amendment brought before them. It was not, he believed, brought forward chiefly in order to protect the tenant farmers of Ireland against the oppression of which they had heard so much from the Nationalist Members—its motive was not so much humanitarian as political. The desire of the hon. Member for Cork was to obtain Home Rule for Ireland. How was that to be obtained? By making the government of Ireland by the Imperial Parliament impossible—and the government of Ireland by the Imperial Parliament was to be rendered impossible by a general strike against rents. This policy was by no means a new one on the part of the hon. Member for Cork. For what was it that he took off his coat? Was it in order to assist the tenant farmer? Not at all. For that purpose he declared he would never have taken off his coat. It was by means of the agrarian question that he hoped to obtain legislative independence for Ireland. It was not the interest of the hon. Member for Cork and his followers that there should be a settlement between the Irish landlords and the Irish tenants. Their intention was to use the agrarian question as a lever by which to force Home Rule. If that question were settled, the hon. Member for Cork's trade would be at an end, and he would be an agitator without an occupation. That was the reason why the hon. Member for Cork, again and again, in his speech, insisted that there was no possible settlement of the Land Question apart from the settlement of the question of the government of Ireland. The hon. Member wished to keep open the agrarian sore, so that he might succeed in his ultimate aim. But ought not this very circumstance to inspire the House with the greatest suspicion as to any statements put forward on the agrarian question by the hon. Member for Cork and his followers? The hon. Member invited the House to affirm that, in consequence of the fall in the prices of agricultural produce, it was impossible for the Irish tenants to pay their rent; and he further asked hem to condemn any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed at a time when prices were higher. With regard to this later point, if it were true that the existing rents were fair and just, there would obviously arise no question whatever of calculating a system of State-assisted purchase upon rents which were too high. Her Majesty's Government had stated that, in their opinion, the rents in general were not too high; and, that being so, the House was not called upon to decide upon the abstract question which the hon. Member for Cork had brought forward. He considered that question, in its abstract form, an exceedingly difficult one. It was clear that the Land Act of 1881 was of a very special character, and that it imposed upon the State certain obligations in any future dealings with the Land Question. How far those obligations extended would be a matter requiring most careful consideration; but it was futile for the House to attempt to consider it, unless they had some definite proposal before them. But was it true that the rents were at present too high in Ireland? The hon. Member for Cork gave no reasons to induce the House to think that rents were high; but, on the contrary, merely assumed that it was his business to prove. The hon. Member for North Mayo had endeavoured to supplement this deficiency. It was not denied that, to some extent, prices had fallen; but why did the hon. Member for North Mayo select the year 1878 for the purpose of making comparison between the prices of a former period and those of the present time, seeing that the judicial rents were fixed within the last three or four years? If prices had been falling ever since 1878, that was rather an argument for supposing that the probability of a further fall had been taken into consideration by the Commissioners in fixing the judicial rents. The average prices of staple products in Ireland, at the present time, were in every case higher than those upon which Griffith's valuation was based; and it had been considered well within the truth to say that Griffith's valuation was, on an average, 15 per cent below the fair letting value of Irish property. The average of present rents might be taken to be 10 per cent above Griffith's valuation; so that whereas prices were higher, rents were lower now than at the time of that valuation. Moreover, the prices of the principal articles of consumption had fallen, and were still falling. Tea, tobacco, and flour were lower than at the time of Griffith's valuation, and that consideration ought not to be lost sight of. Look, again, at the deposits in the banks. The deposits both in the savings banks and in other banks were enormously greater now than they were some years ago, and those deposits were largely made by the tenant farmers of Ireland. [*Cries of* "No!"] If not, how was it that, at the bidding of the Land League, it was possible so effectually to "Boycott" the Munster Bank? [*Laughter.*]

An hon. MEMBER: That's your knowledge of Ireland; no bank ever was "Boycotted."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR said, it was further a notorious fact that when legal proceedings had been taken against tenants who had refused to pay their rents, not only the rents but the costs of the proceedings had been paid. There was another cause, besides the pretended inability of the tenants, for the non-payment of rent, and that was the action of the National League—the terrorism under which the tenants were placed. They had been told that evictions and agrarian outrages had been in proportion to each other. He was not certain that the facts would justify the assertion; but if it really was so, he believed the explanation to be this—that there was a common cause both of the outrages and of the evictions, and he believed that cause was the action of the National League itself. In other words, the outrages had taken place in those parts of the country where the National League was most powerful, and the evictions had taken place in the same districts, because the National League had interfered to prevent the tenants from paying their rents. It was not fair to speak of the landlords of the present day in terms that might be applicable to the rack-renting, evicting landlords of generations past. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) made an appeal the other night to the Irish landlords not to insist to the uttermost farthing upon their legal rights. Every Member on that side of the House would cordially join in that appeal; but he did not believe it was needed. He could not believe that the Irish landlords were so blind at the present time to the fact that their position imposed duties no less than it conferred privileges. These duties had, unfortunately, been made very much more distasteful and their performance greatly discouraged by the action partly of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, and partly also of the hon. Member for Cork. Of all the defects of the Land Act of 1881, one of the gravest was the serious blow dealt at the friendly relations between landlords and tenants. The Commission which the Government proposed to appoint had been criticized as if its whole business were to examine into the question of rents, and to determine whether they were or were not too high. He did not understand that it was limited to that scope; but, even if it were, its appointment would have been fully justified. The Government held certain views with regard to rents in Ireland. If they were wrong, it was exceedingly desirable they should be made sensible of their error. If they were right, it was equally desirable that the correctness of their judgment should be made manifest to the country at large, and the hollowness exposed of a protest put forward, not that justice might be done between landlord and tenant, but to provide fuel for the maintenance at red heat of a mischievous political agitation.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said, on one occasion he had been showing a friend the beauties of a particular district of Scotland, when the latter remarked to him that there seemed to be only one subject of universal interest, and that was the sacred subject of whisky. In the same way it might be said that there was only one subject of universal interest on the Ministerial Benches—namely, the sacred subject of rents. He supported the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), because he thought it was most important that some expression of opinion should go forth from this House deprecating evictions, and that some sympathy should be uttered by other than Irish Members for the sufferings and hardships which the tenants of Ireland underwent. It had been admitted by nearly every speaker that the prices of agricultural produce had fallen since the judical rents had been fixed, and it was contended by the hon. Member for Cork that this had rendered the payment of those judicial rents impossible. On this point the testimony of Irish Members both above and below the Gangway was unanimous, and completely overbore the assertions of the Representatives of the landlords upon the other side of the House, and rendered it unnecessary to appoint a Commission to inquire into the question. The time was coming when the margin between the amount that the tenant got out of the land and the amount of the rent would have to be extended at the expense of the rent, so as to secure the prosperity of the great body of the people. The object aimed at by this Amendment was to have a fair bargain and a just one. There were some things which might be very good logically, but which you could not carry out; and he would like to see a Government which would endeavour to pay the rack rents of Irish landlords out of the pockets of the working classes of this country. He doubted whether the present or any other Government would be so silly as to put that proposal before the House of Commons in the form of a definite legislative measure. They could not forget that the Land Questions in England and Ireland were far more closely connected than some hon. Members believed. He thought the people of this country were learning something from their Irish friends as to what was the just claim of the tenants in regard to landlords. It was said, however, that they must not deal with the difficulty in Ireland in consequence of the bogus theory about the Act of 1881 being a guarantee to the landlords. The working classes of England were of opinion that the land system of Ireland was one of the principal causes of the trouble in which we were at present placed. But his Irish Friends must not suppose he thought that their demands could be satisfied by a solution of the Land Question. If the Amendment were not carried what would happen? If the sentiments which he and others held were true the sad series of events would happen that was predicted by his hon. Friend the Member for Cork. The Party opposite were going steadily towards coercion. Depend upon it they would have to deal with coercion when they met again. He should be glad if the country could escape from the misfortunes which that proposal would entail upon them. If there were one thing certain from the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian it was that the mass of the Liberal Party in this country would not telerate coercion in Ireland; and if Ireland were not to be governed by coercion he was of opinion that that country must have the government of its own affairs. In the meanwhile he hoped that some *modus vivendi* might be established such as was suggested by his hon. Friend the Member for Cork.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said, it was difficult for Irish Members to take part in this debate. The ruling from the Chair had placed narrow bounds to the flights of their fancy. In the few remarks he intended to make he should try to confine himself strictly to the terms of the Amendment. One thing was pretty clear—namely, that the Irish landlords would be judged by the country after this debate to be not so black as they had been painted. He thought they had a right to be thankful and satisfied that their reputations had not as yet been much tarnished by the accusations of hon. Members opposite below the Gangway. He would not have trespassed on the time of the House but for one reason, which he would state presently, because he had noticed manifestations which showed that the House considered that the discussion had lasted long enough. [*Cries of* "No!" *from the Home Rule Benches.*] He knew very well that hon. Members below the Gangway were not tired of debate; but he should not have ventured upon the time of the House on the present occasion were it not that he occupied the happy position of being an Irish landlord. If no Irish landlord rose in the course of the debate their silence would furnish an admirable text for hon. Gentlemen opposite when they revisited Ireland and addressed their constituents. They would say that these landlords—these bloodsuckers, as they were pleased to call the class on the other side of the water—declined to get up in the House of Commons and accept the challenge that had been thrown down to them. He would be able to show that there was at any rate one landlord in Ireland who was not the least afraid to take up their challenge on this or any other point. Hon. Members opposite had made some uncomplimentary remarks about the class to which he belonged. He came into the House when the Member for East Galway (Mr. Harris) was speaking, and the hon. Member made use of the following phrase:—"The landlords were an abominable class." Well, he was prepared to do justice to the hon. Member, and to say that he had always been consistent in his views upon this matter, because, looking back at a speech which he had made six years ago, he held exactly the same views, and it would be admitted that six years in these days was a great strain upon political consistency. Speaking on October 24, 1880, at Galway, the hon. Member said—

> "And when I see this extermination, and when I see the weakness of our people, and when I see tyranny triumphing over right and justice, and when I see my countrymen driven to the four winds of heaven, I say to myself—and I say it here to-day—that if the tenant farmers of Ireland shoot down landlords as partridges are shot in the month of September, Mat Harris never would say one word against it."

This clearly showed that the hon. Member had been consistent in all along maintaining the same political view about landlords. If the Bill of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had been passed into law and if a Parliament were sitting in Dublin, of which the hon. Gentleman would doubtless have been a distinguished Member, he asked the House what the position of Irish landlords would be under such a *régime?* He would tell the House exactly what the position would be. Hon. Members opposite——

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) (who had just entered the House): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. and gallant Member has made an allusion to a speech of mine. May I ask your permission, Sir, to answer any statement the hon. and gallant Member made with regard to myself?

An hon. Member: Ask him to repeat it.

Mr. HARRIS: May I ask the hon. and gallant Member to repeat what he said?

Colonel SAUNDERSON: With the greatest possible pleasure. This is the report of a speech delivered by the hon. Member on October 24, 1880, in Galway, and this is what he said—I presume it is correct; of course I was not there myself—

> "And when I see this extermination, and when I see the weakness of our people, and when I see tyranny triumphing over right and justice, and when I see my countrymen driven to the four winds of heaven, I say to myself—and I say it here to-day—that if the tenant farmers of Ireland shoot down landlords as partridges are shot in the month of September, Mat Harris would never say one word against it."

MR. HARRIS: Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman read what I said before that?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: That is the only part of the speech that is worth repeating.

MR. HARRIS again rose; but Colonel Saunderson did not give way. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. and gallant Gentleman does not give way, he is in possession of the House. No doubt, if the hon. Member wishes to make a personal explanation, the hon. and gallant Gentleman will give way to him.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to make an explanation, I shall with your permission, Sir, be most happy to give way to him.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, previous to using the language which the hon. and gallant Member has quoted, I stated that in the years 1843 and 1844 I had gone out to the Ribbon Lodges in Westmeath endeavouring to put down agrarian crime in Ireland, and that after the efforts I had made, and through the instrumentality of others as well as myself, agrarian crime having been put down, the exterminators came in. I put it to the House now whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman who has spoken, or any other Member in this House except myself, has ever gone out at the risk of his life to put down agrarian crime in Ireland? I am perfectly well aware that using such language—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, by the indulgence of the House, is entitled to make a personal explanation, but not an argumentative speech.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: The hon. Member has not denied the accuracy of the statement.

MR. HARRIS: Read the context.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: As far as I understand the explanation, the hon. Member now informs the House of an interesting fact which I was not aware of before—namely, that he belongs to the Ribbon Organization.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to Order. I wish to know whether the hon. and gallant Member is entitled to accuse the hon. Member of belonging to the Ribbon Organization?

MR. HARRIS: I endeavoured to put down that Organization.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not an accusation, but a statement that the hon. Member has admitted a certain fact. It is for the House to judge.

MR. DILLON: The hon. Member did not admit anything of the sort.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, if the hon. Member repudiates the statement, the hon. and gallant Gentleman will accept his repudiation.

MR. HARRIS: I call upon the hon. and gallant Member to withdraw the statement. I repudiate it as being a most infamous falsehood.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must withdraw that expression unreservedly.

MR. HARRIS (without rising): I withdraw it.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I extremely regret that I caused any annoyance to the hon. Gentleman. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!"] The hon. Member informed the House——

MR. HARRIS: Is the expression going to be withdrawn?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I have nothing to withdraw. The hon. Member himself speaks of his having been to Ribbon Lodges.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. The hon. and gallant Gentleman stated that my hon. Friend the Member for East Galway had admitted himself to be a member of the Ribbon Organization. My hon. Friend distinctly says he never was, and I submit, there fore, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman is bound to withdraw the charge he has brought against my hon. Friend.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I never made a charge.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it must be the wish of the House that these personal recriminations should cease. I am sure the hon. and gallant Gentleman will accept the repudiation.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said, he accepted it absolutely. At the same time, however, he thought that if he stated in this House the fact—and he was not ashamed to state it—that he occasionally visited Orange Lodges, the inference would naturally be that he was an Orangeman. Still, he had no intention to irritate the hon. Member, and if he had done so he apologized. This debate would be of considerable value to Irish landlords. It seemed as if a new canon had been added to the moral code—namely, "Thou shalt not ask for rent." [An Irish Member: Unjust rent.] And it would appear that to ask for rent placed a man outside the pale of civilization. He asked for rent very much as a butcher asked for the payment of his bill. Irish landlords had undoubtedly been brought down to a considerably lower level than that which they had occupied in the past, and, recognizing this, they were quite ready to take their stand alongside butchers and bakers, and only asked that the law should give them the same protection as it afforded to men in positions of that kind. The hon. Member who had preceded him in the debate objected to what he termed the proposal "to bolster up a class in a bloated condition." He could assure the hon. Member that the word "bloated" did not apply, in a pecuniary sense at any rate, to Irish landlords. All trades, professions, and occupations in Ireland were unfortunately in a more or less depressed condition, except one, and that was the occupation of professional politican. If one was to believe the information conveyed through the Press, the trade or occupation or profession of an Irish politician was never in so prosperous a condition as it was just now. There was, no doubt, great depression in Ireland as there was in England and Scotland. But what happened to the holding and owning of land in Ireland in 1881 was this. The State stepped in and made a bargain between the tenant and the landowner, which was to last for 15 years. Before that the landlord and the tenant were absolutely free to deal together. But the State stepped in—he did not object to that—and made what was called a bargain for the tenant, because it was stated that the tenant was not in a position to make a bargain for himself. The debates during the passing of the Bill he had carefully read, and he remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) stated that the landlords, when the Land Act was passed, would be in a better position than they were at that time. He said that they would be better off by getting a small rent that would be regularly paid, than if they attempted to collect large rents that could not be ensured. Even before the Act of 1881 rents were not so high in Ireland as in England; and the result of that measure was that they were reduced by from 20 to 25 per cent. The Land Commissioners had fixed the rents to be paid for 15 years, and the Commissioners took into account the possibility of future depression when they fixed the rents. [*Home Rule cries of* "No!"] Well, some of the Commissioners might not have taken that into consideration. Very stupid men were made Commissioners, who knew no more about land than they did about Chinese, and who were appointed simply because they preferred a certain leading statesman rather than another. An hon. Member who had acted as Assistant Commissioner had told the House that he did not take the possibility of future depression into consideration. That only showed that the hon. Gentleman was not fit for the post. The rule, however, was that the Commissioners should bear in mind the possibility of depression.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: What rule?

Colonel SAUNDERSON said, that it was a well understood thing that there was a rule by which the Commissioners took into consideration the fall of prices when fixing rents.

Mr. MAHONY (Meath, N.) said, he desired to make an explanation. He did not think he had said that the Commissioners did not take into account the possibility of a future fall in prices. What he had said was that, judging by the past, the Commissioners looked forward to a period of prosperity before the next period of depression, and that they did not centemplate the very great and unexpected depression which had supervened.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said, that the explanation of the hon. Member only made his case stronger, because it showed that all the Commissioners without exception took the question of future depression into consideration. Now, was it fair that that House should pass a measure which should secure to the tenants the benefit of any possible inflation in the price of produce, but which should not hold good if prices were to fall? If there had been a great rise in prices there would have been no attempt made to remodel the judicial rent. On the face of it the present suggestion to lower rents was unfair; it was a policy all through of "heads I win; tails you lose." He was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that the Government intended to make rent recoverable. The recovery of debt was part of the law of the land; and if the Government did not enforce the payment of rent how were they to enforce the payment of debt on account of any other claim? Some hon. Gentlemen opposite saw in this declaration on the part of the Government that they wished the landlords to extract the utmost farthing in the way of rent. Personally, he did not think that the feeling that he had the law at his back would make the landlord harder or more exacting. He as a landlord had never acted upon that principle. ["Oh!" *and laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh; but he would not mind appealing to the hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. Biggar) to give him a character for not being a harsh landlord [Mr. BIGGAR: Hear, hear!] What was the object that the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends had in view? They wanted to exterminate the race of Irish landlords; but knowing that they could not be got rid of by open acts of legislation, that democratic level not having yet been reached in that House, they desired to get rid of the class of landlords by the practical device of telling the tenants not to pay rent, and there was an Organization to back those who refused to pay their rents. Special reference had been made to the evictions on the property of Captain Hill at Gweedore, and it therefore was right to put the House in possession of the facts. This was a remarkable property. There were 765 tenants upon it, and the gross rental was £798. It, therefore, could not be considered an enviable property. Some of the tenants only paid half-a-crown per annum, and none paid more than £4, and in all cases the landlord paid the rates. The men eked out their livelihood by going to England and elsewhere to do harvesting and other work, and they left their wives and children at home to cultivate the potato patches and the small fields of oats. When they returned to their native town, they spent the money they had earned in England. [AN IRISH MEMBER: In paying the rent.] He ventured to say that there were thousands, nay millions, of workmen in this country, whose homes were in the back slums of London and other by-cities, who would most willingly change places with the labourers of Gweedore. This property was an Irish exemplification of what was proposed to be done in England, only on a smaller scale, because few of the tenants had three acres, and fewer still a cow. These tenants were in possession of what were practically accommodation allotments, and figures which he could quote showed that their holdings were not at all contemptuously regarded. He held in his hand a list of the prices given in the immediate past for the tenant right of some of the small holdings, and he asked the House to observe that these were the unfortunate people who were represented to be absolutely incapable of paying a farthing of rent. He thought some of the values would rather astonish the House. A great number of the Irish, English, and Scotch landlords would be delighted to sell their property as a whole upon the terms which he should quote. Last year James Boyle had to leave his holding, which he rented at 15*s.* a-year, and for the tenant right a woman named Ellen Cole paid £100. Another case was that of Nellie O'Donnell, whose rent was £1 5*s.*, and who sold her holding to Edward Campbell for £108. A third holding, whose rent was 6*s.* 3*d.* a-year, fetched £80 for tenant right. Now, when the House heard the glowing description of the Home Rule Members of the desperate tyranny of Captain Hill in asking his tenants to pay rent, and when it heard of these immense sums being paid for these very holdings, it would think that there was something wrong somewhere. He was going to tell the House where that somewhere was. There was a branch at Gweedore of the National League, and its president was the Rev. Mr. M'Fadden, parish priest. Now, as parish priest and president of the National League, Mr. M'Fadden was monarch of all he surveyed. The rev. gentleman got to loggerheads with the owner of the estate, and the result was that the branch of the National

League at Gweedore gave orders that Captain Hill's tenants should on no account take any employment from the owner of the hotel which Captain Hill had himself built to improve the place, and that they should not take any engagement with the lessees of the salmon fisheries, who had also incurred Mr. M'Fadden's indignation. Yet hon. Gentlemen opposite below the Gangway would get up and say that these evictions were proof positive of the grinding character of the tyranny exercised over Irish tenants by the blood-sucking landlords. The House would have to learn, if it had not yet learnt it, that in many cases, such as that at Gweedore, evictions were the result, not of a fight between the landlords and tenants, but of a stand up fight between the landlords and their enemy the National League. That was pretty much the condition of things that existed in Ireland at the present time. Reverting to the question of rents he wished to inquire how it was that far higher rents than were now asked for were paid in Ireland from 1852 to 1881? Notwithstanding what was now said about depression of prices they were much lower then than they were now. Wheat was not grown much in Ireland, but he found that in 1852 the price was 7*s.* 6*d.* per cwt., whereas in 1885 it was 8*s.* 3*d.* Oats had risen from 4*s.* 10*d.* to 8*s.* per cwt. Pork, to which he would especially call the attention of the hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. Biggar), had gone up from 32*s.* to 46*s.* per cwt., beef from 35*s.* 6*d.* to 55*s.*, and butter from 65*s.* to 95*s.* [" No ! " *and cries of* " Where ? "] At Cork, which was celebrated for two marketable commodities, butter and Home Rule Members. As regarded the latter commodity, Cork was in the favourable position of supplying between 20 and 30 Members to the Party below the Gangway opposite, and perhaps that accounted for the similarity of tone, sound, and argument that was distinguishable among them. With regard to butter, he saw in the papers that " firsts " had fallen to 11*d.* and " seconds" to 10*d.* per lb. Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite contended that butter had fallen to something like 5*d.* per lb., but that was butter that would never have fetched any price, and was only fit to adulterate butterine. In the opinion of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite there was only one standard for Irish rents, and that was the prairie value. That was the settlement those hon. Gentlemen ultimately contemplated. The word " prairie" had a sweet and pleasant sound. It brought to our minds green fields and flowers; but according to hon. Gentlemen opposite " prairie value " meant the value of Irish land before Irishmen ever put a spade or a plough into it. In those early times only plover, snipe, and such things were to be found on the Irish soil—[An hon. MEMBER: Landlords]—and hon. Gentlemen opposite would have to go back and find out the value of plover and snipe in the time of Brian Boru. He did not think the House of Commons would ever listen to a settlement on a basis such as that, and he was happy to say that the vote at the last Election had finally, he believed for our time at least, decided that the Irish Land Question and the Irish Question in general should never be settled by a Parliament sitting in College Green. He now came to the last part of the Amendment. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) yesterday, in his remarkable and, he would say, very impressive speech, wound up by letting the cat out of the bag as to the meaning of this Amendment. At the end of his speech the hon. Member informed the House that there would be crime and outrage in Ireland in the coming winter. Hon. Members might sometimes have seen an engine-driver with the throttle-valve in his hand, which he could turn at will and admit the steam or shut it off. If he admitted the steam the machine performed its functions. So the hon. Member for Cork was in the same position—he held the throttle-valve of crime in Ireland. He had turned it on before, he could do so again. [*Cries of* " Order ! " *and* " Withdraw ! "]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) wished to know if the hon. and gallant Member was in Order in imputing to the hon. Member for Cork the incitement to crime by saying that he in the past had practically brought crime about by turning on the throttle-valve of crime ?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman would not be in Order if he intended to impute to the hon. Member for Cork that he had brought about crime in Ireland. [*Cries of* " Withdraw ! "]

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I am expressing my opinion. This is not an Assembly sitting in College Green. [*Loud Parnellite cries of* "Withdraw, withdraw!"]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Sir, I rise to Order again.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I have nothing to withdraw. I have stated my opinions, and I have based them upon a foundation which, I believe, cannot be shaken. [*Renewed cries of* "Withdraw!"] If the House will allow me, as I have been directly challenged as to the accuracy of my statements, I will read to the House——

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I rise to Order. The hon. and gallant Member who has just been addressing the House distinctly stated in the plainest language that the hon. Member for Cork could stay crime when he liked and that in the past he had turned on the throttle-valve of crime. I wish to know whether that statement is in Order, imputing as it does to the hon. Member for Cork the incitement to crime in Ireland?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already stated that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman intends by the expression he made use of to impute to the hon. Member for Cork the act of having turned on crime at his pleasure, I do not consider that it would be a Parliamentary expression, and I think it should be withdrawn.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said, that in obedience to the ruling of the Chair he would withdraw the expression. A very remarkable speech was made some years ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). In that speech the right hon. Gentleman made the following remarks:—

> "Circumstances occurred which drew attention to the Irish Church. . . . When it came to this, that a great gaol in the heart of the Metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the state of Ireland, and when in Manchester policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics."

Two months after, on the 15th of January, 1880, a speech was made in America, from which he quoted the following passages:—

> "Mr. Gladstone, in one of his Mid Lothian addresses, said that it was not until a policeman had been shot at Manchester by a Fenian and Clerkenwell Prison had been blown up that the Irish Church Question came within the domain of practical English politics."

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether what the hon. and gallant Member is now saying comes within the scope of the Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: It remains to be seen how the hon. and gallant Member is going to apply his remarks.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said, that hon. Members would not wait for the application. He believed that hon. Members—even those most opposed to his views—would see that it had a direct bearing upon the question. The quotation continued as follows:—

> "He admitted in that way that you have to act upon English public opinion in some extraordinary and unusual manner in order to obtain any attention for the Irish Question. We are, therefore, obliged to make the situation a very hot one indeed. We desire to restrain this movement within the strict letter of the law, and we have strong hopes of passing over this winter without much bloodshed or suffering; but it is impossible to suppose that the great cause can be won without shedding a drop of blood."

That was the application placed by the hon. Member for Cork upon the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. The hon. Member came over to Ireland and made the situation a very hot one indeed—a hot one in the sense in which he spoke in commenting upon the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. He would leave to the House, to every right-thinking man within those walls, the invention of an epithet that would adequately describe such a course as that. But what was the meaning of the Amendment? There was to be crime in the winter; and the Amendment, if carried, would in the eyes of the public place upon the shoulders of the Irish landlords who would be provoked to evict the *onus* of that crime. The Amendment meant that if crime occurred in Ireland the blame for it would be shifted from the shoulders of the hon. Member for Cork and placed upon those of the landlords. Did the hon. Member for Cork and his followers think that they were dealing with an abject and craven Government? He thought that before many months were over they would make, to them, the very painful discovery that these threats of crime, which after all he believed dwelt only in the imagination of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite, would not paralyze the hands of the Government and induce them, as the late Government appeared to have been induced, to hand over the government of Ireland to the Irish National League. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been severely criticized on the manner in which British money was about to be spent. Hon. Gentlemen opposite objected to the Irish people accepting a gift from the people of this country on any terms. It would degrade them—it would debauch the morality of Ireland. For his own part he did not see that English gold was more debasing in its character than American dollars. He had every confidence that if the Government at present in Office dealt firmly and justly and generously with Ireland the tenant farmers, who were now getting heartily sick of this agitation, which filled the pockets of politicians and denuded their own, would believe at last that England meant to be just to Ireland, and that England would be generous, not, as in the past, at Irishmen's expense, but by putting her hand into her own pocket, and would show that she felt she had a debt to pay to Ireland. He admitted that much. He confessed that in looking back upon the history of English dealing with Ireland by Governments of all kinds he was of opinion that they had put the parable of the good Samaritan into effect, only slightly inverted. They first knocked Ireland down, and when they saw her wounded and bleeding by the wayside, their conscience pricked them, and they seized the first Irishman who passed that way with money in his pockets and fleeced him of the money that was to heal the wound. The English people were beginning to realize that they must turn over a new leaf and deal with Ireland on other principles; and he believed that if they did, no matter what hon. Gentlemen opposite might say or do, Ireland would prove grateful to the country that really had her welfare at heart.

Mr. HARRIS: As a matter of personal explanation I wish to state that at the conclusion of the speech to which the hon. and gallant Member referred I asked the people I was addressing not to interpret my language as inciting them to the commission of crime—that not only was I opposed to the shedding of human blood, but that I was actually opposed to the shedding of the blood of the lower animals. I trust that this will exculpate me from the charge of inciting to crime.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.), said, he did not know whether the landlords of Ireland would feel complimented by the hon. and gallant Member comparing them to butchers; but he was afraid there were some landlords in Ireland who were as truly murderers as any criminal who ever stood in the dock, for

> "You take my life
> When you do take the means whereby
> I live."

The right hon. Member for Lincolnshire seemed to linger at the door of the Cabinet closed against him, and to humble himself in the dust before the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as if he indulged a hope that a place might possibly be found for him hereafter. The most pressing of Irish questions was that of evictions, which would increase in number and in severity. If nothing were done, and if the position of the Government were not modified, a condition of things would arise which would overtax all our resources. He was anxiously waiting to hear the views of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). He was curious to learn the attitude of the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine), who did not now pass through the Lobbies with that bustling air with which they were all familiar. The hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), who had always held himself out as a special providence watching over the interests of the British taxpayer, had subsided into a pensive melancholy. Would the policy of stern, vigorous, and merciless eviction be supported by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, who last April said he would inquire into the merits of the case put forward on behalf of the tenantry, and would, in the meantime, pass a Bill to stop evictions, and would, if necessary, give outdoor relief? This plan, at all events, had the merit that it made inquiry go first. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, said that although there was a case for inquiry, evictions were meanwhile to be enforced with all the rigour of the law, and then, if the Commission reported in favour of the tenantry, relief was to be given them. This was like saying to every evicting landlord—"What thou doest, do quickly." Those who stood most in need of relief were those to whom it would be refused. He implored the Government to remember the consequences of the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbances Bill in 1880. The present condition of Ireland was very similar to what it was in the autumn of that year, when a Bill which would practically have had the effect of stopping evictions was thrown out by the House of Lords. The Government would do well to remember the wild justice of revenge that followed the unchecked evictions of that period, and to keep in their minds the blood-bought lessons of the past. It was absurd to say that to speak of these things was to bring about the fulfilment of your own prophecies, because if they were not to be spoken of we should be estopped from the use of all argument founded upon experience. He appealed to the Government to be wise in time.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Joseph Chamberlain*,)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howell, Bill to consolidate, simplify, and amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. Picton.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 39.]

House adjourned at half after Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 26*th* *August*, 1886.

MINUTES.] — NEW MEMBER SWORN — Sir Matthew White Ridley, baronet, *for* Lancashire (Blackpool Division).

SELECT COMMITTEES—Standing Orders, *nominated;* Selection, *nominated;* Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILL — *Ordered—First Reading*—Shop Hours Regulation * [40].

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*Read first, second, and third time and passed*— Local Government (No. 3) * [223]; Local Government (No. 5) * [237]; Local Government (No. 6) * [238]; Local Government (County Divisions) * [225]; Local Government (Gas) * [222]; Local Government (Highways) * [235]; Local Government (Poor Law) (No. 7) * [236]; Pier and Harbour * [201]; Tramways (No.1) * [195].

Read first and second time—Gas (No. 2) * [214]; Local Government (No. 7) * [256]; Local Government (No. 8) * [262]; Local Government (No. 9) * [262]; Local Government (No. 10) * [269]; Local Government (No. 11) * [277]; Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2) * [261]; Tramways (No. 2) * [208]; Tramways (No. 3) * [213].

Read first time—Electric Lighting * [278]; Public Health (Scotland) (Urray Water) * [279].

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath.

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS.

MR. LEWIS (Londonderry) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether the appointment of assistant revising barristers in Ireland this year was made by the Lord Lieutenant on the 2nd of August; whether that was many days after the resignation of the late Prime Minister; whether such appointment was made many days before the similar appointments were made last year; whether such appointments were made appointing the several barristers to particular constituencies, instead of leaving the barristers to arrange with the county chairmen, as prescribed by the Act passed in the last Session of Parliament; and, whether one of the assistant revising barristers so appointed was a defeated candidate at the recent General Election?

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it had not been the invariable practice of successive Governments in Ireland, whether Liberal or Tory, to exercise, before going out of Office, any patronage they had in the way of existing vacancies; and whether, in relation to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, to the effect that one of the Assistant Revising Barristers was a candidate at the recent General Election, it was not the fact that one of the Assistant Revising Barristers appointed by the Conservative Government was also a defeated candidate at the General Election in 1885?

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) said, he also wished to ask whether it was not the fact that last January several executive acts, such as the appointment of magistrates, were performed by the Government of Lord Salisbury up to the resignation of the Ministry?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): In answer to the Question which has been put by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), I have to say that the late Lord Lieutenant appointed 28 Revising Barristers on the 2nd of August, which was some days subsequent to the resignation of the late Prime Minister and some time before the date that similar appointments were made last year. One of the gentlemen appointed had been a candidate at the General Election. I am informed that the Lord Lieutenant's warrants appointed Barristers for counties generally and not for particular constituencies; but in some instances the letters enclosing the warrants stated that a Barrister was appointed for a particular division. In answer to the Questions put by hon. Gentlemen opposite I am not in a position to state what the practice of successive Governments has been, for my knowledge does not extend over many successive Governments, but I know that appointments have been made in the way suggested. As to the further Question as to a gentleman having been appointed last year who had contested a constituency, I am not aware that any gentleman who addressed a constituency as a candidate was appointed subsequently to his having done so. One gentleman who had acted as Revising Barrister was subsequently a candidate, but at the time he was appointed he had never in any way come forward as a candidate for Parliamentary representation, and I have his assurance for saying that at the time he accepted the appointment he had no intention of doing so.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: He was a member of the Constitutional Club.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—GALWAY ASSIZES (SLIGO).

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the rule adopted in the other three provinces of Ireland, of holding the assizes in the chief city of the province, is departed from in the case of Connaught, where the assize is held in Sligo instead of Galway; and, whether the present arrangement will be altered?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said, that no such rule as that stated in the Question existed as to the places for holding the Winter Assizes, which depended upon considerations of convenience.

ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—CAVALRY SADDLES.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, If he will state how many Cavalry saddles, pattern 1884, have been made, how many issued, how many returned, how many condemned, either returned or unissued; and, whether any steps have been taken to recover damages from the contractors who have supplied defective saddles; and, if not, why not?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): Of 1884 pattern 3,692 saddles were made. Of these 2,627 were issued, including 50 for Canada. None have been condemned as unserviceable. About 150 have been returned damaged by regiments. All the rest have been recalled. The issue of these saddles was made rather as an experiment than as a regular issue; some defects, however, were discovered when they came into use, and modifications and further trials have since been made. The saddles will be re-issued when the modifications of their present pattern, which are now under consideration, are finally approved; but as the present pattern was passed by its Inspectors the War Office is not able to recover damages from the contractors.

SEEDS (IRELAND) ACT—REPAYMENTS.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether about ninety-five per cent. of the money advanced under the Seeds Bill has been repaid, and if the collection of the remaining five per cent. is attended with considerable difficulties to the unions responsible for it; whether the information in his possession shows that these difficulties are caused partly by the fact that the inhabitants of the unions in debt are poorer than the average, and partly because the magistrates at Petty Sessions have some doubt as to their jurisdiction, owing to the lapse of time, while the Quarter Sessions, who have jurisdiction, require proof of delivery; and, if, under these circumstances, he would inquire as to what portion of the balance is fairly recoverable, and if he would request the Local Government Board to see if an arrangement could be made by which, on the unions paying a share of the balance owing, the remainder might be wiped out and the account closed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): Between 92 and 93 per cent of the loan has been repaid. In many cases the difficulty in obtaining payment has arisen rather from indisposition on the part of the recipients of the seed than from positive inability to pay for what they received. No doubt, the inhabitants of some of the Unions still in debt are poorer than in Unions where the rate has been fully paid up; but there would be evident objections to selecting any particular Unions with a view to remission. I am not aware of any reason for such a doubt on the part of magistrates with regard to their jurisdiction as is suggested. Magistrates are bound by law to adjudicate on poor rate cases "at any time after the date of the warrant authorizing the collection." As for proof of delivery, the signed receipts of the recipients have been produced when asked for, but the Local Government Board are not aware of any general demand of this kind. My Predecessor in Office announced last March a concession on the part of the Treasury by which the uncollected balance will not be pressed for until the month of April next year.

IRELAND—STATISTICS OF POPULATION—CORK COUNTY.

Mr. DONAL SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the population of the county of Cork; what is the proportion of Catholics and Protestants in that county; what is the number of magistrates in that county; how many are Protestants and how many are Catholics; and, how long has Lord Bandon, the present Lieutenant of the County, held that office, and how many Catholic and Protestant magistrates has he appointed during his Lieutenancy?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): With regard to the population and religious professions of the inhabitants of the county of Cork I fear I cannot add anything to the information already before the House in the Census tables. Also, with regard to the number of magistrates of each religious persuasion the House is in possession of all the information at the disposal of the Government, an elaborate Return having been presented in June last on the Motion of the hon. Member for South Kilkenny (Mr. Chance). The present lieutenant of the county has been in office for nearly 12 years, and of the magistrates now in the Commission who were appointed by him 118 are Episcopalian Protestants and 49 Roman Catholics.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): In connection with the last Question may I ask whether the Return to which the right hon. Baronet referred distinguishes between those magistrates who were Protestant and those who were Catholic?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I believe it does. I believe that was the object of the Return.

ARMY CONTRACTS—SUPPLY OF ARMY CLOTHING.

Mr. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, What steps are taken to notify to manufacturers in Ireland periodically the intention of Government to receive tenders for the supply of Army clothing?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter) (who replied) said: In answer to the hon. Member I have to state that there are only two firms in Ireland who are known to be capable of undertaking contracts for the making up of Army clothing—one in Dublin and one in Limerick, and these firms are applied to whenever supplies are required. If any other competent firms wish to tender they have only to apply to have their names placed upon the list, when particulars will be sent to them from time to time.

Mr. HOOPER inquired whether it would not be to the advantage of the Public Service that the information should be furnished to all well known firms of manufacturers in Ireland; and also whether the hon. Gentleman was aware that one of the most eminent firms in this branch of business was now excluded—namely, Messrs. Mahony and Co., of Blarney?

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked if he understood the hon. Gentleman to say that there were only two firms in Ireland capable of fulfilling contracts of this kind?

Mr. NORTHCOTE said, he stated that if any firms wished to tender for such contracts, and if they would signify their wish to the War Office their cases would be considered, and forms of tender would be sent to them from time to time. He was not aware of the circumstances with regard to the firm which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hooper) mentioned, but if the hon. Member would communicate any facts he would see that inquiry was made.

Mr. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked if the hon. Gentleman would state what steps were to be taken by any firms who might consider themselves competent to tender for the supply of Army clothing, and to have their names placed on the list?

Mr. NORTHCOTE said, that in regard to all tenders the course adopted was to advertise in the local papers. There were also firms which were in the regular list of the War Office to which special notices were sent. If the local firms who saw the advertisements which appeared from time to time in the local papers would communicate with the Secretary of State for War, their communications would be attended to in the proper course.

Mr. MAHONY asked if they were to understand that in future all supplies for Army clothing would be advertised in the Irish local papers?

Mr. NORTHCOTE said, he had no reason to suppose that any course different from that which had hitherto been found convenient was likely to be pursued, which consisted in notifying from time to time as supplies were wanted in the principal local papers and to the firms which were accustomed to supply the Department.

PUBLIC HEALTH — HYDROPHOBIA — M. PASTEUR'S RESEARCHES.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) asked the President of the Local Government Board, What progress is being made by the Committee appointed last Session to inquire and report on the subject of M. Pasteur's researches with reference to the prevention of hydrophobia; and, whether the Report of the Committee will be shortly presented to this House?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I am informed that considerable progress has been made by the Committee. A Sub-Committee visited Paris, and had several long interviews with M. Pasteur, who explained to the members most fully and unreservedly the whole details of his treatment. The Committee examined a large number of the persons who had undergone treatment, and so far as this investigation is concerned the Committee were fully satisfied that M. Pasteur's treatment had been effective. They hope, before long, to be in a position to report the results of their investigation to the Local Government Board; but before doing so they are most anxious that time should be allowed for the Committee to ascertain that experiments on animals, conducted on behalf of the Committee, have yielded the same results as those detailed and demonstrated to them by M. Pasteur.

INDIA (BOMBAY)—CASE OF MR. A. MORTON, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MURPHY (Dublin, St. Patrick's) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Andrew Morton, of the Engineering Service, Public Works Department, India, and who was, in 1884, employed on the Nizam of Hyderabad's State Railways; whether Mr. Morton was arrested on a charge of embezzling the Railway funds, and committed by a Colonel Dobbs for trial before the High Court of Bombay, where he was acquitted by the jury without calling on his counsel to reply to the case made against him; whether, subsequently, a Departmental inquiry into Mr. Morton's conduct took place under the presidency of Lieutenant Colonel Bullock, and whether the Committee of Inquiry reported that "the clerks in Mr. Morton's office had combined to deceive him;" that at the time the defalcations with which he was charged occurred "he was overwhelmed with work," having "the duties of Manager, Traffic Superintendent, and Storekeeper, in addition to his other work," and that "his mind was distracted by a multiplicity of duties arising from the arrival and departure of the Viceroy;" and whether the Committee completely exonerated him from being guilty even of gross carelessness; whether, after many months' suspension, being reinstated in his office, he was obliged to proceed to a station in Northern Bengal at his own expense, and his increments of pay stopped down to the present time; and, whether the Indian Government will order that Mr. Morton's incremental pay be restored to him, and that he shall receive suitable compensation for the indignity which he suffered?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham) (who replied) said: Mr. Andrew Morton, while employed on the Nizam of Hyderabad's State Railway, was arrested on a charge of embezzlement, and committed for trial before the High Court of Bombay, but the charge was afterwards withdrawn. A Departmental Inquiry took place with the result substantially as stated in the Question. The Committee of Inquiry exonerated him from "the charge of gross negligence," but considered that he had been unbusinesslike in his dealings, especially in regard to documents on which payments of money had to be made. When released and reinstated in his office, the arrears of his pay and the expenses incurred in his defence were passed to him, and he was transferred in the same grade and on the same pay to Bengal. The Government of India, however, thought that his unbusinesslike method could not be passed over, and therefore left him to proceed to his new station at his own expense, and directed that his salary should remain stationary till further orders. The Secretary of State in Council saw no reason to interfere with the discretion of the Government of India in this matter.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—BOARD OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What proportion of the expenses of the administration of the Board of Intermediate Education in Ireland bear to the total income of the Board and to the amount expended yearly in fees to schools and rewards to pupils; whether the two assistant Commissioners discharge duties which might be as efficiently performed by one secretary at less than half the cost; and, if so, whether there is any intention of filling up the vacancy at present existing in the office of assistant Commissioner?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The proportions mentioned are respectively 10·6 and 21·6 per cent, as will be seen by a reference to the accounts of the Commissioners. The Board do not believe that the duties of the two Assistant Commissioners could be as effectively performed by one Secretary, and the Government agree in this opinion. However, we are in correspondence with the Board as to whether some economies cannot be effected without detriment to the Public Service.

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—THE HERRING FISHERIES ON THE SOUTH COAST.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the practice of fishing for herrings on the South Coast of Ireland before the month of June has been declared by the Inspectors of Fisheries for that Country to be highly detrimental to the fishing industry; and, if so, whether, as the Inspectors have no power to make a bye-law on the subject, he will procure an Order in Council prohibiting the practice complained of within twenty miles of the Irish Coast, thereby following the precedent set by the Order made and approved by Her Majesty on the 29th April 1869, whereby dredging for oysters between certain dates on parts of the East Coast was prohibited within twenty miles of the shore?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The fact as to the opinion of the Inspectors of Fisheries is as stated by the hon. Member. I will look further into the matter during the Parliamentary Recess and see whether it would be practicable and desirable to promote such an Order in Council as is suggested.

TURKEY—DISTURBANCES IN ARMENIA (VAN).

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received, and can give the House, any information regarding the conflict between a body of Turkish soldiers and the Armenian population of Van, which was reported in the newspapers about three weeks ago as having occurred owing to the interference of the local authorities in the election of an Armenian bishop?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): From a Report received from Her Majesty's Vice Consul at Van, it appears that the disturbances to which my right hon. Friend refers took place on the 4th ultimo, on the occasion of the election of Members to serve in the Armenian National Council of that city. I am glad to be able to say that Mr. Barnham states that the extent of the damage inflicted on both sides has been much exaggerated, and that no serious wounding and no fatality occurred. The interference by the Local Authorities was at the instance of the Acting Bishop. I shall be happy to show to my hon. Friend the Report of the Vice Consul.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST RIOTS—TRIAL OF PRISONERS.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, having regard to the excited state of feeling likely to exist for some time in Belfast, he proposes to permit the two men Walker, returned for trial for the murder of Head Constable Gardiner, to be tried before a Belfast common jury?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): I think that at the present moment Belfast would be a very unsuitable place for trying the cases referred to in the Question of the hon. Member; but it is to be hoped that the excited state of feeling there will not continue for any considerable time.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman say whether it is intended to try these prisoners at the coming Winter Assizes?

Mr. HOLMES: That is a Question which I cannot answer at the present time, because it is premature to take it into consideration.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: May I further ask whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman does not consider this a proper case for the exercise of his power of applying to the Queen's Bench to change the venue, as was done by his Predecessor, Mr. Attorney General Johnson, in an agrarian murder case three or four years ago?

Mr. HOLMES: I must repeat I cannot answer the Question at the present moment.

THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES—A ROYAL COMMISSION.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, How many estates, sugar and coffee estates principally, have been thrown up and abandoned in the West Indian Colonies by their owners since the introduction of Free Trade and of bounty-paid sugar to Great Britain from the Continent; how many estates have been sold by the Government of the West Indian Colonies under the Incumbered Estates Act; how many estates (with their extent in acres) have been sold by the Government of the West Indian Colonies for Land Tax unpaid; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intends to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of those colonies?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I am not able to give the House much information with regard to the first three Questions. The Governments of the West Indian Colonies do not sell estates under the Incumbered Estates Act, but the sales are made by the Incumbered Estates Commissioners on the application of mortgagees and others interested in the estates. A Return of the number of such sales could be obtained from the Commissioners if the House desires it. The other two Returns would be troublesome and expensive, and would have to be obtained from the Colonies. Her Majesty's Government has no intention of appointing a Commission to inquire into the condition of these Colonies. A Royal Commission, appointed by right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and of which the hon.

and gallant Member for Portsmouth (Sir William Crossman) and my hon. Friend the Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool (Mr. Baden-Powell) were Members, made an admirable Report on many of these questions in 1882-3.

POST OFFICE—POSTMASTERSHIPS—THE WELSH LANGUAGE.

MR. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, in filling up the vacancy in the Post Office at Ruabon and in other Welsh-speaking places in future, he will, where practicable, give the preference to candidates who have a knowledge of the Welsh language?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In answer to my hon. Friend, I may say that some days ago I caused inquiry to be made whether any of the candidates for the vacant postmastership at Ruabon could speak Welsh. There has not been time to obtain the necessary information, and the office will not be filled up till I have considered the point. And I may say, further, that I shall be sincerely glad if, consistently with the requirements of the Public Service, I can adopt the course suggested by my hon. Friend.

CYPRUS—THE ANNUAL TRIBUTE.

COLONEL BRIDGEMAN (Bolton) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government propose to take any steps to capitalise the annual tribute paid by Cyprus to Turkey, in order to lighten the heavy burden pressing upon the inhabitants of Cyprus, and to relieve the English taxpayers of the annual Vote for the Grant in Aid?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): This subject is one of great interest and importance, and is occupying our careful attention. My hon. and gallant Friend knows very well that, however desirable, it is surrounded with much difficulty, and I cannot yet say whether any practicable arrangement can be come to; but we are in communication with the Treasury upon the subject.

ARMY—AGE RETIREMENT.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, To be so good as to state the precise rule or regulation of the Service under which officers are retired permanently from the Army on account of age; from what date that rule has been in force; whether it has been since that date of universal application; and, whether any exceptions have been made to it; and, if so, in what cases?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Rules as to retirement from the Army on account of age, including exceptions, are embodied in the Royal Warrant of June 10, 1884. They are numerous, and cannot well be given within the limits of an answer to a Question; but the information is within the reach of the hon. Member in the Library, and the Royal Warrant itself is obtainable from Messrs. Clowes, or through any bookseller. The Rules came into force, some in 1877 and others on July 1, 1881, and they have since been strictly followed. The retirement of captains by age has been recently suspended by Royal Warrant of August 10, 1886.

BURMAH—INUNDATION OF MANDALAY.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he has yet received any information which he can communicate to the House in regard to the causes and results of the failure of the bund or embankment, and the flooding of Mandalay; and, whether he can state under what department of the administration and under what officer in particular the responsibility for guarding against such a serious source of danger was vested?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The following information respecting the recent inundation at Mandalay has been received from the Viceroy:—The breach in the bund is 300 feet wide. Not more than a dozen bodies have been found, as people had plenty of time to clear out of their houses. Total loss of life is probably under 25. No European seems to have been drowned. Much of food stuffs in the bazaar has been destroyed or spoilt; but piece goods were generally saved before the water rose. The obvious cause of the accident was an unprecedented rise of the river. When the flood assumed extraordinary proportions danger was apprehended, and every effort was made to strengthen the embankment. It was also patrolled day and night; but, of course, precautions of this kind are not of much avail if the weight of water is greater than the earth can sustain. The whole of the low-lying parts of the town have been inundated. Arrangements were at once made to supply gratuitously food to persons rendered destitute; but very few applicants have presented themselves. The flood is subsiding. The water in the river being now lower than that behind the bank, the latter has been cut lower down stream in order to let the accumulated water escape. There is no suspicion of the accident having been occasioned by any malicious person. The Commissioner has been instructed, as soon as he has ascertained all further facts, to report them in detail.

TRADE MARKS ACT—REGISTRATION OF "FANCY WORDS."

Mr. LOCKWOOD (York) asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, in view of three Judges having respectively decided that words divorced from their dictionary meaning become "fancy" words, entitled to be registered under "The Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883" (46 and 47 Vic. c. 57), he will give to the Comptroller and other officials at the Patent Office instructions that the above-mentioned decisions be duly carried out?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Having regard to the desirability of obtaining an authoritative decision on the subject of the registration of dictionary words as trade marks, the Board of Trade have determined to present an appeal in the case recently decided. Meanwhile, the Comptroller will not refuse to register any word which has no connection with locality and cannot possibly be a word of description.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE DRAINAGE OF THE BANN.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Ulster Canal question, in connection with the drainage of the Bann, will be referred to the proposed Royal Commission?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I can only state generally that the References to the Commission on this head will, of course, be of a general character, and that it will be for the Commissioners to decide whether there is such a connection between the Ulster Canal and the drainage of the Bann as to necessitate that it should form part of the inquiry.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether the Commissioners would have it within their discretion to extend the Reference made to them?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Of course they cannot extend the referece.

ARMY—"APPREHENDED DISTURBANCES IN ENGLAND."

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following paragraphs, which appeared in *The Times* newspaper of Monday, 23rd August, page 7:—

> "Apprehended Disturbances in England.—Sir Evelyn Wood, the General Commanding the Eastern District, pursuant to instructions from the War Office, has issued orders to the Volunteers in his District to assemble for picket duty, and to hold themselves in readiness to assist in quelling rioting and disturbance. The order will probably continue in force throughout the ensuing autumn and winter.
>
> "The contingent selected from the Chelmsford Corps consists of one officer, one serjeant, two corporals, and twenty privates. Twenty rounds of ball cartridge have been served out to each man. Their duties are to parade twice a week near the Shire Hall, and to be prepared at any moment to turn out and assist the police if necessary. The picket will be changed once a month; but the present picket will remain on duty till the end of September.
>
> "It is understood that the order has been issued in preparation of apprehended dynamite outrages and Irish disturbances in the Northern and Midland towns;"

and, whether there is any foundation for the statements contained in the paragraphs?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, he was happy to inform the hon. Gentleman that there was no apprehension of a disturbance in England or in the Eastern district; that the General Commanding in that district had not issued any instruction of the kind referred to; and that probably the paragraph in *The Times* originated in the fact that in February last the attention of commanding officers had been drawn to No. 447 of the Volunteer Regulations, which imposed upon Volunteer officers the necessity of taking adequate precautions for the safety of arms intrusted to their care.

STATE OF IRELAND—CONSTABULARY FORCE AT MILLSTREET, CO. CORK.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why so large a force of Constabulary is kept stationed at or about Millstreet; and, whether the district is extremely peaceful?

An hon. MEMBER asked whether the neighbourhood of Millstreet had become more peaceful since the day on which speeches were delivered there by the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner); and whether the right hon. Baronet would lay on the Table of the House the reports of the speeches which were made in the presence of the police, and forwarded by them to the authorities in Dublin?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I believe the district of Millstreet has become more peaceable since the time alluded to by the hon. Member behind me; but I am not prepared to give any undertaking about the reports, because I have not heard of them until to-day. With regard to the Question put to me by the hon. Gentleman (Dr. Tanner), I have to say that there are 25 policemen at Millstreet, and their presence is necessary in order to afford protection to persons whose lives and property have, it is feared, been placed in danger by inflammatory speeches made in the neighbourhood, and other causes. There is a good deal of "Boycotting" and intimidation in the district, though actual outrage is kept in check by the presence of the police.

DR. TANNER: I should like to ask the right hon. Baronet by whom these speeches were made? And as the hon. Gentleman opposite has made a personal accusation against me for a speech I am said to have made at Millstreet, I desire to tell the hon. Gentleman that I shall be only too happy to let him have a copy of the speech this afternoon.

NAVY—DISCHARGE OF SHIPWRIGHTS AT HAULBOWLINE.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What was the reason of the discharge of the shipwrights recently employed at Haulbowline; and, whether, bearing in mind the great depression of the times, the Government will advocate the re-employment of the men discharged, and the pressing forward of the works to completion?

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT) (Sheffield, Ecclesall) (who replied) said: The hon. Member renews the Question he addressed to me on Tuesday. I can only repeat that the works will be completed in 1888, and that no other course is open to the authorities but to discharge the men gradually as no longer required.

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ACTS, 1883 AND 1885—SCHEME FOR COTTAGES IN MACROOM UNION.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Why, and for what reasons, the labourers' cottages which have been passed in the district of the Macroom Union are not being proceeded with?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There has been no delay on the part of the Local Government Board in this matter. After necessary preliminaries the Guardians' petition for confirmation of their scheme was received by the Board on the 12th of June. The sanitary officer had omitted to send with it several indispensable documents. After these had been obtained from him, the usual inquiry, after public notice, was ordered to be held on the 27th and 28th of last month, and the result will be communicated to the Guardians at their next meeting.

EMIGRATION—THE EMIGRANTS INFORMATION BUREAU.

MR. RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the arrangements for the establishment of the Emigration Information Office have been completed; and, if so, when the office is likely to be opened?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle):

The arrangements for the establishment of an Emigrants' Information Bureau are very nearly completed, and we hope to open the office during the month of October. My hon. Friend is, no doubt, aware that it is not intended that the Bureau should take any part in promoting emigration; but it will collect and circulate all the freshest and most accurate information possible with respect to emigration to all our Colonies.

BURMAH—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION—THE COST.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What is the total cost incurred in connection with the Military operations in Upper Burmah since the order for the Military expedition on the 11th of November last; and, what is the present rate at which cost is being incurred in these operations?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): According to the Revised Estimates for 1885-6 the cost of military operations in Burmah up to March 31, 1886, was 39 lakhs. The account of the actual expenditure has not yet been received. According to the Budget Estimate the cost of military operations for the current year is estimated at 30 lakhs. The Government have recently been informed by telegraph that this estimate will be exceeded, and are awaiting further information as to the amount.

INDIA—MIGRATION OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS TO HILL STATIONS.

SIR ROPER LETHBRIDGE (Kensington, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is a fact that of late years the provincial Governments of Lower Bengal, the Punjaub, the North Western Provinces, Madras, and Bombay, have followed the example of the Supreme Government of India by removing every summer to a hill-station; and, if so, how many persons, including members of council, secretaries, clerks, and other subordinates, accompany each Government in its migration; and, what is the cost of these migrations?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The Provincial Governments of Lower Bengal, the Punjaub, the North-Western Provinces, Madras, and Bombay, are accustomed to move to hill stations during the summer weather. There is no detailed information at the India Office as to the number of persons who accompany each Government in its migration, nor as to the cost; but the Secretary of State is now making inquiries from the Government of India upon the subject.

IRELAND—DISTRESS IN THE WEST—MR. TUKE'S REPORT.

MR. RATHBONE (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House and print Mr. Tuke's Report on the Relief of Distress in the West of Ireland, undertaken by him at the request of the Government?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Personally, I see no objection whatever to the Report referred to being presented, if the hon. Member wishes to move for it; but I feel some doubt to what extent I would be justified in regarding it as an official document at my disposal. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) stated in this House on the 8th of March, Mr. Tuke undertook, at his request, a work of benevolence in the West of Ireland in connection with seed supply, and he afterwards communicated to the right hon. Gentleman a Report on his labours. I think, therefore, it is rather for the right hon. Gentleman than for me to answer this Question?

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said, he thought it would be greatly to the advantage of the Public Service that the Report should be printed.

ASIATIC RUSSIA—THE FREE PORT OF BATOUM.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government will take any further steps, in concert with other Powers, regarding the recent infraction of Treaties relating to the free port of Batoum, as shown in Lord Rosebery's Despatch?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government do not propose to carry the case beyond the position taken in Lord Rosebery's Despatch of July 3.

BULGARIA — REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government are able to afford information to this House regarding the origin and cause of recent events in Bulgaria, and regarding the development of those events as affecting the international position of the Bulgarian State?

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What further reports have been received from Her Majesty's accredited agents in Bulgaria, Servia, and Turkey, about the revolution alleged to have taken place on Saturday last, the 21st instant, which is stated to have resulted in the abdication of Prince Alexander; whether it is a fact that Russia, one of the Great Powers, has been an accessory in promoting the success of the popular undertaking in Bulgaria; and, what steps Her Majesty's Government purpose taking to vindicate British interests in the two recent infringements of the Treaty of Berlin by Russia, in Batoum and Bulgaria?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): In answering the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), I hope my hon. Friend the Member for South Worcestershire (Sir Richard Temple) will allow me to reply, at the same time, to his Questions on the same subjects. I have already stated to the House the occurrences of the 22nd of August—namely, the seizing of the Prince and his removal from the capital. It is now known that the act was committed by a small body of military officers with a detachment of soldiers. It was not till the evening that, after repeated attempts, a Provisional Government was formed. The Prime Minister, M. Karaveloff, firmly refused to take part in the movement. No communications of what passed could reach this country till Tuesday. It now appears that, on the regiments in the Provinces threatening to march on Sofia, the revolt, which Mr. Stephen, Her Majesty's Acting Agent and Consul General, calls "military," failed. The Provisional Government on Tuesday resigned; the military leader made submission to M. Karaveloff, who has resumed office, to save the honour of the country and preserve order, with full powers. On Monday loyal troops entered Sofia, the guard at the Palace was replaced, and the military conspirators were placed under arrest. News of public rejoicing was received from many quarters, especially from Philippopolis, where the Consul General had reported on the 25th that the President of the National Assembly had published a general appeal to the loyalty of the nation, and universal enthusiasm prevailed. The Representatives of the Powers at Sofia met on Tuesday and approved of the resumption of office by M. Karaveloff to preserve order. It is now known that Prince Alexander was placed on board of his own yacht in the Danube, and taken to Reni Russi in Bessarabia. We are informed by the Acting Consul General at Galatz that the Prince landed yesterday at 10 A.M., being given by the Russian authorities perfect liberty to proceed by such route as he preferred. The hon. Member for Mid Cork asks Questions which are based on the most inaccurate recital of the facts. The "undertaking" in Bulgaria has not, so far, been "successful;" it was not "popular;" and I do not know on what grounds he alleges against any Power an infringement of the Treaty of Berlin in connection with these events. My hon. Friend the Member for South Worcestershire will, I am sure, see that inasmuch as the events which I have described, as far as they are authentically known, were altogether in the nature of a surprise, I can give the House no satisfactory account of their origin and cause—and still less of their probable development. The quotation from *The Times* newspaper made by the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) appears to be a comment upon reports which had reached the writer. I do not think that the House will desire that I should express concurrence or otherwise in such comments or inferences. I have stated the facts as known to the Government. We have no knowledge of the report stated in the second Question. The third Question is one of anticipation of future events, and of the course of Her Majesty's

Government in a hypothetical case, which I cannot undertake to answer.

NORTH WALES—COLLECTION OF TITHES.

Mr. DILLWYN (Swansea Town) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been directed to the recent resistance to the collection of tithes in the parish of Llanarmon yn Yale, in North Wales; and, if so, whether he has reason to believe that such resistance was of an organised nature, and is likely to extend to other parishes?

Mr. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.) also asked the Home Secretary, Whether his attention had been called to a letter printed in *The Bauer Cymrw* of August 21, signed J. Jones, in the course of which the following extract occurred:—

> (Translation.)—"It is likely that the sale will take place some day next week. If so, we are inviting all the farmers in the country here that day. It will be a great day to remember. Preparation day for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales will that day be;"

and, whether that constituted a resistance to the law of an organized nature as described by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn)?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir; my attention has been called to this matter, and I am informed by the Chief Constable of the county of Denbigh that the resistance to the collection of tithes in the parish of Llanarmon is of an organized nature; but that it is impossible for him to say at present whether it is likely to extend to other parishes. In answer to my hon. Friend I have to say that my attention has been recently called to a letter signed by John Jones, one of the farmers distrained upon; and as far as I can gather from the learned language in which it is veiled—the Welsh—it does indicate an organized resistance to the payment of tithe.

Mr. SEXTON (Sligo, S., and Belfast, W.) asked whether it was the intention of the Government to send a military officer to take command in Wales?

[No reply.]

BOARD OF TRADE—THE LABOUR BUREAU—APPOINTMENT OF MR. BURNETT.

Mr. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether Mr. Burnett has been appointed to an official position in the Board of Trade, in connection with the Labour Bureau; whether he will state the nature of that appointment, with the qualification and salary attached to it; whether Mr. Burnett is the Secretary of the Society of Amalgamated Engineers; whether he is taking part at this moment in the International Trades Union Congress at Paris, of which he has been elected President; and, whether such post has been accepted with the knowledge and consent of the Board of Trade?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Mr. Burnett has been appointed to an official position as stated, and at a salary of £300 a-year. He is to assist in the collection and preparation of labour statistics, and in obtaining information as to the employment of labour. He is at present Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, but will resign that appointment when he takes up his duties at the Board of Trade on the 4th October. He is understood to be at present taking part in the International Trades Union Congress in Paris; but it appears to the Board of Trade that there is no reason why he should not fulfil the engagements he has made previous to his assumption of his official duties.

Mr. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne) asked whether it was not the fact that, at the meeting referred to in the last Question, Mr. Burnett had spoken against the Socialist views of the French and German Socialists, and deprecated the introduction of such matters at a Trade Union Congress?

Mr. BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If he could lay before the House Papers explaining the scope and object of the new Labour Bureau, for the information of working men?

Baron HENRY DE WORMS: In answer to the hon. and learned Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Addison), I believe that Mr. Burnett's words may bear the interpretation he puts upon them. I have received the private Notice of the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool. If he will move for a Return or explanatory Memorandum, I will endeavour to give him the best information in my power. Some details still require adjustment. I shall be glad if the hon. Member will confer with me as to the form of the Return.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside): As I am responsible for the appointment of Mr. Burnett, perhaps the House will permit me to supplement the answer given by the hon. Gentleman. In consequence of a Resolution of this House, I undertook to form a Bureau of Labour and of Statistics, in March last, which was to inquire into the organization, remuneration, and expenditure of the working classes, and I undertook the organization of the new Department under the superintendence of Mr. Giffen, the Chief of the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade. With regard to all questions relating to the organization and remuneration of labour, I know of no man in England so well-informed, or more thoroughly in touch and sympathy with the working classes, than Mr. Burnett. I appointed him without any solicitation on his part, or any of his friends. I have known Mr. Burnett for 18 years, and I regard him as one of the most remarkable men of his class in this country, and no man is more adapted to the post to which he has been appointed. I undertook to allow him to complete his engagements before he entered on his duties.

BURMAH—PUBLIC WORKS—RAILWAYS.

MR. DALRYMPLE (Ipswich) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If Her Majesty's Government have had their attention called to the urgency of prosecuting public works in Burmah; if there is any prospect of the railway near Mandalay, which has already been surveyed, being begun; and, whether an offer has been laid before the Secretary of State and the Government of India for the construction of the railway, the prosecution of which would greatly assist the administration of Burmah?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The attention of Her Majesty's Government has been for some time directed to the urgency of prosecuting public works in Burmah, and they have addressed communications to the Government of India on the subject. Of the railway from Rangoon to Mandalay—a distance of 416 miles—166 miles are completed, and 62 are under survey. Several offers for the construction of this railway have been submitted to the Secretary of State; but until an answer is received from the Government of India no decision can be arrived at.

MR. DALRYMPLE asked whether it was not the case that the Government of India was waiting for the decision of the Secretary of State, and that while each waited for the other nothing was done?

SIR JOHN GORST said, he did not believe that that was the fact; but if his hon. Friend gave Notice of the Question he would inquire and ascertain.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Universities (Scotland) Bill early next Session?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): Yes, Sir; I do hope to introduce such a Bill next Session.

PARLIAMENT — PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Newington, W.) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the seven recommendations of the Select Committee on the Ventilation of the Houses of Parliament, contained in the Second Report of the 31st of May last, are all or some of them, and, if so, which of them is being carried out; and, whether there is a prospect of the works involved in them being completed by the time Parliament re-assembles in February?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET)(Dublin University): The Committee on the Ventilation of the House has been re-appointed, and has held its first meeting to-day. I am authorized to state that the Committee is satisfied that its recommendations are now being carried out with as little delay as possible, and I hope that the necessary works will be in the main completed before Parliament re-assembles next year.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — MANUFACTURE OF NORDENFELT GUNS AT WOOLWICH.

COLONEL **HUGHES-HALLETT** (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true, as stated in *The Admiralty and Horse Guards Gazette*, that Nordenfelt rapid-firing shell-guns have been manufactured in the Royal Gun Factory at Woolwich for the inventor and patentee of those guns, the late Government charging the said inventor the sum of £150 per gun so manufactured and delivered to him in the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich; whether the Government subsequently re-purchased from the patentee at £360 per gun these same guns which had cost him only £150 per gun; and, whether these guns were tried, proved, and accepted by the same authorities who manufactured them, and whether it has since been discovered that the cost of manufacture of the said guns to the late Government exceeded the cost charged to Mr. Nordenfelt; and, if so, by how much?

THE **SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE** (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said: The facts are not accurately stated by this paper. The quick-firing guns were not made at Woolwich. The circumstances were as follows:—A contract was entered into with Mr. Nordenfelt for a certain number of these guns with fittings and mountings complete, and, to facilitate supply, it was arranged that the barrels only should be made for him in the Royal Gun Factory. He was charged at the rate of £131 19*s.* 5*d.* and a fraction per barrel, being the cost of production, *plus* 10 per cent; and, therefore, the price originally tendered by Mr. Nordenfelt—namely, £376 per gun and mounting complete—was lessened by this amount. The guns and fittings were, like all guns for Her Majesty's Service, by whomsoever made, tried, proved, and accepted by the authorities of the Royal Gun Factories. As appears from the above, this cost of the barrels to the Government did not exceed that charged to Mr. Nordenfelt.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—WEXFORD COUNTY.

MR. **WILLIAM REDMOND** (Fermanagh, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the eviction of sixty-two persons, being the wives and children of thirteen small farmers on the estates of the Marquess of Ely in Wexford County; whether it is true that these people have been driven from their holdings into the workhouse, simply because they were unable, through bad seasons and fall of prices, to pay the rent demanded by the landlord; whether it is true that large numbers of farmers have been served with processes of ejectment under similar circumstances in Wexford County; and, whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to interfere in some way to prevent evictions during the coming winter?

THE **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The persons referred to, who were 49 in number, were not the occupiers of agricultural holdings, as the hon. Member appears to suppose. They were the tenants merely of small houses, held at rents which, I am informed, were not excessive. They obtained other houses in the town of Fethard; but were compelled by the influence of the local branch of the National League to leave them and go to the workhouse. I believe it is the case that writs have been served on a number of farmers in the county of Wexford. We cannot prevent evictions; it is our duty to protect the officers of the law in its execution. I have already deprecated harsh action on the part of landlords.

MR. **WILLIAM REDMOND** said, it was absolutely untrue that these people—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. **T. C. HARRINGTON** (Dublin, Harbour): I beg to give Notice that I shall ask the right hon. Gentleman—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. **SPEAKER**: The hon. Member must give Notice of his Question to the Clerk at the Table in the usual way.

MR. **T. C. HARRINGTON**: Perhaps the House will allow me to ask the Chief Secretary one Question, which I am sure he can answer now. It is, whether it is not the fact that the local branch of the National League have nothing whatever to do with the tenure of houses in towns; and whether the action which the right hon. Gentleman has referred to has not actually been taken by a

House League, and not by the National League?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: If I have done injustice to the National League by mistaking its action for that of a House League I should be very sorry; but the action of a House League is at least equally objectionable.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that the congregation of the Albert Street Presbyterian Church, Belfast, on the recommencement of public service in their church on Sunday last were attacked by a Roman Catholic mob, and their pastor, the Rev. Henry Montgomery, insulted; and, whether the freedom of public worship in Belfast will be vindicated by the Government?

MR. SEXTON (Sligo, S., and Belfast, W.): As the Member representing the Division of Belfast which is concerned in this Question, I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that the earliest stage of any alleged disagreeable incidents in connection with this church came later to a series of attacks on the lives and property of Catholics and Catholic churches and schools in the same quarter of Belfast; and also, whether he is aware that on Tuesday last the Executive Committee of the Magistrates of Belfast held a meeting on the subject, having before them a letter from the Rev. Mr. Montgomery, and the Reports which had been made by the Resident Magistrates and other officers who were charged with the preservation of the peace of the district on the day in question, and whether he is aware that they unanimously agreed that the statements were in most cases exaggerated and in many cases altogether unfounded, and that having regard to the present excited state of the town the Committee of Magistrates were of opinion that any annoyance which individual members of the congregation suffered in going to or coming from the church were not of a serious character; and whether, under these circumstances, the freedom of public worship in Belfast needs any vindication from Her Majesty's Government?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir

answer the Question of the hon. Member, of which I have had no Notice. I asked the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Belfast to postpone his Question the other day, because I observed that the reports published in the newspapers with regard to the occurrence were of a character which certainly was at variance with the reports I have received. The alleged occurrences have been closely inquired into by the Executive Committee of the Magistrates of Belfast, and I am happy to be able to inform the hon. Member that they were found to be greatly exaggerated. The Rev. Mr. Montgomery himself was good enough to meet the Magistrates, and he expressed himself as perfectly satisfied with the arrangements which had been made for protection and the manner in which the duty was performed, and he thanked the Inspector General for what had been done. He subsequently wrote to the Committee of Magistrates, stating that, while the Executive had done all that could possibly be expected for the protection of the congregation, yet in some cases individual members of the congregation had been insulted and some few assaulted, though not seriously, and he thought that the Constabulary had not been sufficiently energetic. This matter was specially considered by the Committee of Magistrates convened for the purpose, and the result was that they were satisfied that due precautions had been taken. I may add that the Committee of Magistrates consisted of persons representing the different phases of opinion in Belfast.

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS—ATTENDANCE OF LIGHTKEEPERS AT DIVINE SERVICE.

MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether, as is done in Scotland by the Commissioners of Northern Lights, provision will be made for the attendance at Divine Service on Sundays of lighthouse-keepers on isolated rocks off the Irish Coast; and also for the education of their children, by increasing the number of relieving stations, or otherwise providing for the instruction of numbers of boys and girls growing up without elementary education?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, Member's Question in the absence of the detailed information from the Lighthouse Authorities, which is again being pressed for.

POST OFFICE—FEMALE CLERKS.

Mr. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the female clerks employed in the Clearing House Branch of the Office of the Receiver and Accountant General of the Post Office are frequently kept at work till seven P.M. and later, both on week-days and on the Saturday half-holidays, although their official hours are from ten till four on week-days, and from ten till one on Saturdays; whether it is true that, although this overtime work is nominally optional, the female clerks are not allowed to leave at their regular hours, and are led to believe that any refusal to do this extra work will be detrimental to their chances of promotion; whether it is true that, since October last, several female clerks in the Clearing House Branch have applied for sick leave; and, whether, if these things are the case, he will take steps to prevent the overworking of the women in question?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that, owing to the rapid increase in the number of telegrams, the work of the Clearing House Branch has been greatly augmented, and a considerable amount of overtime work is unavoidably imposed upon the staff until the arrangements for affording relief can be completed. The subject is one of considerable difficulty, as, although the employment of 82 extra clerks has been authorized since the reduction of the telegraph rate, the accommodation only admits of the employment of 62; and steps are being taken as speedily as possible to obtain new premises. I find that out of a staff of over 150 the number detained on extra duty up to 7 P.M. last week averaged four per day for the first four days; but 43 stopped on duty on Friday in order not to interfere with the Saturday half-holiday. The additional clerks already appointed are daily becoming more efficient, and are reducing the overtime work. Every effort is being made, by rotation of duty, to make the work as light as possible to individuals. It would be impossible to exempt the female staff from the obligation to perform extra duty in times of emergency altogether without striking a very serious blow at the employment of female labour in the Post Office. The Returns of sick absences in this branch do not show any exceptional increase since October; and although there are two or three cases of prolonged absence these cannot well be attributed to pressure of business consequent on the reduced rate, as the absences date from a time preceding the pressure.

LOCOMOTIVES ACT, 1878—BYE-LAWS OF ROAD TRUSTEES.

Mr. MENZIES (Perthshire, E.) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether his attention has been called to the recent prosecution of Messrs. Crichton, Burrelton, Perthshire, for contravention of a by-law regarding locomotives which had been approved by the Home Secretary in 1880, whereby Messrs. Crichton had been fined for using waggons in Forfarshire, which it is legal and unobjectionable to use in Perthshire; if he will consider the question whether the power to pass a by-law for merely regulating the use of locomotives on roads includes the power to affect the construction of locomotives and waggons, which is carefully and minutely specified in a separate section of "The Locomotives Act, 1878," as regards locomotives, and in various Statutes as regards waggons; and, whether he will in future endeavour to aim at introducing greater uniformity into the by-laws made by road trustees when granting or withholding his approval to such by-laws?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.), in reply, said, he was aware of the inconvenience that arose on account of the divergence of the bye-laws in different counties. Whether that inconvenience should be remedied by special legislation, or in a Local Government Bill for Scotland, was a question for consideration.

ADMIRALTY—ENGINE ROOM ARTIFICERS.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will specify what consideration the Royal Naval Engine Room Artificers have received from the Board of Admiralty; and, whether any, and what, steps have been taken to improve their position since their case was mentioned and supported by two Members of the present Government in the Debate on the Navy Estimates on the 18th of March last?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I stated the other day that the position and comfort of the engine room artificers will receive every consideration from the Admiralty, and to that statement I have nothing to add. Since the 18th of March the Admiralty have been in communication with the Treasury in reference to a proposed increase of these chief petty officers; but, with this exception, nothing else has been done to improve their position. The engine room artificers are a valuable body of men, and have done good service; but, so far from there being any difficulty in obtaining them at present, good candidates for entry have to be turned away as the list is full.

MAURITIUS—OFFICIAL DISSENSIONS.

MR. BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, What steps he proposes to take in consequence of the unfortunate state of affairs in the Mauritius?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My hon. Friend may well describe the state of affairs in the Mauritius as unfortunate. It has had my very careful attention, and, having read the complaint of Sir John Pope Hennessy against the Lieutenant Governor, and of Mr. Clifford Lloyd against the Governor, I have come to the conclusion that the situation is one most prejudicial to the interests of good government in the Colony. In these circumstances, I have already addressed a despatch to Sir John Pope Hennessy, stating that the relations between himself and his principal officer are regarded by Her Majesty's Government with grave dissatisfaction, and that the responsibility for this state of affairs rests, not with one only, but with both of them. I added that the good government of the Colony and the restoration of friendly relations would be promoted by the immediate separation of the two officials, and I directed Mr. Clifford Lloyd to proceed at once to the Seychelles, to take up the duties of Chief Civil Commissioner. What further steps, if any, it may be necessary to take in the interests of the people of the Mauritius I am not yet able to inform my hon. Friend, as I wish to reserve any final opinion until we are sure that we have before us all the facts necessary to a just decision.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) asked whether it was not the fact that Sir John Pope Hennessy was not consulted before the appointment of Mr. Clifford Lloyd, and whether the traditions of the Service had not thereby been disregarded?

MR. E. STANHOPE said, that such a thing happened occasionally in the Service, although he was not sure whether it was the case in the present instance or not.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The gentleman who was then Colonel Stanley made the appointment.

BURMAH — THE MILITARY EXPEDITION — APPOINTMENT OF COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What has been the result of the communications stated by the Under Secretary on the 25th March last to be in progress between the Viceroy and the Secretary of State in Council, with a view to putting all the forces in Upper and Lower Burma under the Commander in Chief; and, whether the troops in Upper and Lower Burma are still under separate commands?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The troops in Upper and Lower Burmah are still, as a temporary measure, retained under separate Commanders. As soon as the cool weather commences, when the troops in Burmah will be largely reinforced, Sir Herbert Macpherson, the Commander in Madras, will proceed to Burmah and take the personal command of the whole of the forces in both Upper and Lower Burmah.

ENGLAND AND CHINA—TREATY REGARDING BURMAH.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will state to the House the terms of the treaty or agreement concluded with China on the subject of the rights of suzerainty, tribute, &c., claimed by that Power over Burma; and, whether Papers will be laid upon the Table in connection with these negotiations?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The substance of the Agreement respecting Burmah signed at Pekin on the 24th ultimo is as follows:—Her Majesty's Government agreed that the highest authority in Burmah should continue the customary ten-yearly Missions. China agreed that in all matters whatsoever appertaining to the authority and rule which England is now exercising in Burmah, England should be free to do whatever she deems fit and proper. China agreed to protect and encourage trade between China and Burmah, the frontier to be marked by a Delimitation Commission, and the conditions of the frontier trade to be settled by a Frontier Trade Commission. Her Majesty's Government consented to countermand the proposed Mission to Thibet, and the Chinese Government undertook to take steps to promote and stimulate trade between India and Burmah. A copy of the Agreement will be presented to Parliament as soon as it is received from Pekin in a formal shape.

LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND)—BYE-LAWS AS TO BICYCLES AND TRICYCLES.

MR. MENZIES (Perthshire, E.) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he is aware that there is now a great want of uniformity in the by-laws of the different counties of Scotland applicable to bicycles and tricycles; and, whether he will introduce a Bill making the Secretary for Scotland the approving authority in the case of those by-laws instead of the sheriff of each county, or undertake to deal with the matter in some measure of a cognate nature?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): The answer which I gave to the hon. Gentleman's previous Question applies to this one.

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I wish to be allowed to supplement an answer which I gave to the hon. Member for Portsmouth on Tuesday last, with reference to the allegation that certain officers who have been engaged in the Ordnance Department have held shares in public Companies concerned in the manufacture of guns. I wish to read the following letter which I have received from Sir Frederick Campbell:—

"August 25.

"Sir,—With reference to the Question asked in the House of Commons yesterday as to my holding shares in the Sir William Armstrong and Mitchell Company, during the period I held the appointment of Director of Artillery and Stores, I beg to assure you I held no shares in the Company named while I held that appointment. I left the War Office in February, 1883; in April, 1883, I purchased 15 shares in the Sir William Armstrong and Mitchell Company, but sold them in October, 1883; and it was only during that period, and while unemployed, that I had any connection with the Company.—Your obedient servant,

"F. A. CAMPBELL, General."

The practice at the Ordnance Department is to require every officer connected with it to cease any connection with any firm likely to become War Office contractors. This rule includes officers in any capacity whose duties call upon them to arrange contracts, or to engage in any matter which may involve personal considerations.

IRELAND (SOUTH-WEST DISTRICT)—SIR REDVERS BULLER.

MR. E. R. RUSSELL (Glasgow, Bridgeton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What will be the relation of General Sir Redvers Buller to the General commanding Her Majesty's Forces in Ireland; whether General Buller will have authority to direct and control the movements of the Military in his district without the intervention of the Commander in Chief; and, whether he will have powers to try and sentence persons charged as well as to pursue offenders?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I think the hon. Member is under some misapprehension as to the nature of Sir Redvers Buller's appointment. Sir Redvers Buller will hold a civil appointment in the counties of Kerry and Clare. As holder of that appointment, it will be his duty to superintend any general operations whenever the military may be called in to assist the civil power, and it will be his duty to regulate such operations. But he will not hold a military appointment at all, and he does not go to Kerry to establish martial law, as some hon. Members have suggested, nor even to strain the civil law. He is to act under the powers of the law, with a view to the organization of the arrangements for the restoration of order, and the detection and punishment of crime in Kerry and Clare. Sir Redvers Buller, like other persons holding the appointment of Divisional Magistrate under the Crown, will not act judicially in Petty Sessions.

NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE—RULE 2 (ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE).

Mr. E. R. RUSSELL, Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., the Appointment of a Military Officer over an extensive district in Ireland, with undefined administrative and magisterial powers; but, the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and, not less than 40 Members having risen accordingly:—

MR. E. R. RUSSELL: I can assure the House I am very reluctant to interfere with the course of Business. I should not have done so, if I could have reconciled it with my sense of duty to acquiesce in an appointment which seems to me to be contrary to Constitutional principles, adverse to the future interests and peace of Ireland, and likely to introduce bad precedents into our own Government. I should have been glad if the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) to the question I have just put would have enabled me to abstain from making this Motion; but I must say that, having regard to the great position of Sir Redvers Buller—to his undoubted military position—to the fact that a military position is the only one in which he is known to the country, and also to the circumstance that it was not exactly in the tone and spirit of the right hon. Gentleman who has just answered my question that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller, nor was it in that spirit that the appointment was spoken of in the House of Lords by the Chief of the Government—I feel bound to go on in the course I have determined to take in the matter. I feel also that it is very essential, considering what may be in store for us in the future, that Members should have an opportunity of formally protesting from the outset against a course which I am sure hereafter they will be very glad not to have gone into when it was proposed. I go on the simple principle that it is contrary to the genius and spirit of our institutions for military men to be called from their military duties to perform those of civil magistrates. I may have to contend, at the outset, with a feeling that the state of things in Kerry is so bad that it is scarcely becoming for anyone to interfere with any step that may be taken for mitigating the condition of that county. I yield to none in horror and detestation of what is going on in Kerry. It would argue a great lack of imagination, and also of heart, to hear of the circumstances in that county without such a feeling. The darkness, the sudden interruption in the night, the horrible association of violence and terrorism, the absolute confusion and cruelty of the whole business must strike us all with horror. But it is not the first time in the history of this country, or of other countries, that events and processes of this kind have been going on, and that it has yet been necessary to protest against the means by which the civil power endeavours to stop them. A very difficult and serious circumstance in this matter is that—as was stated the other night by a right hon. Gentleman who lately occupied a high Office in the Government of Ireland—there is every sign that the people of Kerry either sympathize with these proceedings, or are determined, as a matter of consulting their own interest, not to interfere with them. That produces embarrassments which we are bound to consider. But such things as these only exist in ill-governed countries. We cannot improve the government of a country by handing over its civil administration to military men. If the administration of the law in Kerry is not efficient, it is our duty, as far as we can, to make it so. Now, the noble Lord at the head of the Government in "another place" has admitted that the administration of the law and police in Kerry is unsatisfactory. The system, he said, had drifted into an unreasonable shape, and that was a matter which required careful overhauling and inquiry, and probably entire re-organization. These are facts notorious to both sides of the House; but I believe they will not be met in the same spirit on both sides. We may test the spirit of the Administration by the manner in which the Marquess of Salisbury addresses himself to this difficulty. If we found the Prime Minister thoroughly re-organizing the Civil Staff—if we found him bringing into play all the resources of the great Civil Service of this country, in order to produce a better state of things in Kerry—then he would deserve in any result our praise; and it is our principle, on the Liberal side of the House, that he would be adopting the course most likely to conduce in the end, along with those greater measures we advocate, to the results we all desire. Instead of that, the noble Marquess goes beyond civil life altogether, and chooses a soldier. What soldier does he choose? Why does he choose that soldier? He told us that he desired the attention of minds which had been engaged in the solution of similar problems in other parts of the globe. What are those problems that Sir Redvers Buller has solved in other parts of the globe? How did he solve them? The answer to these questions leads us very close to the conviction that the policy of the Government at the present moment, by the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller—which I take to be by far the most important announcement of policy which they have made — is to degrade Ireland at once to the level of a savage and a barbarous country. The Government, it is true, do not say that—they do not formulate it—but it is the spirit and the effect of their measure. They are acting upon it. I think it must have struck many people who have watched the Irish discussions of the last few months that there has been a remarkable contrast between that private conversation and much of the writing in the Press upon which in reality their policy is founded, and the spirit and the tone of speeches which are made in this House. Happily, the speeches made in this House, and the tone of our policy, is infinitely superior to what we hear at dinner tables and in clubs, and in mingling in general society. But this appointment of a military man to re-organize society in Ireland they announced to satisfy the unworthy feelings which prevail throughout a large part of the country against the Irish. And then, by the humane lips of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, they are enabled to say that the gallant General is taking up a purely civil position. I cannot bring my mind to believe that that is the case. I do not deny that the right hon. Gentleman professed—and I am sure with truth—that he would, under all circumstances, exercise any influence that he might have upon Sir Redvers Buller in a spirit of justice, humanity, and kindness. But that is not enough. The gallant General was chosen because he was a soldier, and he would not have been chosen—being a soldier—unless it had been thought there was work there fit for a soldier. I have no doubt the Government had fully persuaded themselves that Sir Redvers Buller had the qualities which exactly fitted him to undertake the task of restoring order in a thoroughly unruly and disturbed district. To do this was to adopt a principle contrary to our Constitution—flying in the face of all the principles of civil liberty in which we have been brought up. The statement of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he introduced this matter to the House, was scarcely consistent with the idea of the subordinate position in which Sir Redvers Bullers is now attempted to be placed by the explanations of the Government. The importance of this officer, the rank he holds in the Army, forbids such a supposition. Of course, we all know perfectly well that it is a common thing for men who have developed in military command, or even service, qualities which the Army is well adapted to produce in men of good calibre and abilities — it is a common circumstance for them in the latter part of their life to undertake civil duties, and to perform those duties satisfactorily. But these men sacrifice their military positions—they sacrifice their military character—they become, to all intents and purposes, civilians. They are under civil control. They do not expect to go back into the Profession. They part altogether with both the prospects and the associations of military life. The consequence is that they are not liable to the dangers and temptations by which Sir Redvers Buller will be beset. If the Chief Secretary for Ireland would whittle this matter down so that Sir Redvers Buller would be accepting this office just as a half-pay officer takes the Governorship of a workhouse, or the Governorship of a goal, then he would meet our views. But we know that would not have met the views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Marquess of Salisbury, and would not have met the views of Sir Redvers Buller. I think there have been times when a soldier would have thought this an undesirable function. I do not, however, pronounce on that. I hold that a good policeman is quite as respectable as a good soldier. The only thing is that a good soldier does not always make a good policeman; and the Constitution of the country has always assumed that no one in the position of a soldier should have to perform the duties of a policeman. Another question for us to consider is, what security will there be against great infringements of liberty when this new rule of Sir Redvers Buller begins? It is a great innovation. A precedent is being set. But we have a very bad example—not exactly of the same kind—which leads us to expect evil results. What occurred when Mr. Clifford Lloyd was employed in Ireland? Mr. Clifford Lloyd was a civil officer, and he was under a Coercion Law, but not under the Crimes Act. It seems to be pretty notorious that he resorted to very extraordinary excess of licence, and took great liberties with the rights of the people. It was said that he gathered together, on various pretexts, young men in rooms in a village, and that he then examined them on matters which were likely to get them into trouble in connection with a revolt against the Government of Ireland. Mr. Clifford Lloyd had not the slightest warrant for that. It was neither the regular law nor the extraordinary law at the time; but he was praised by a lamented statesman, and encouraged to adopt courses of that kind. If such things as those were done in the green tree, what will be done in the dry? I, for one, in this matter, have learned the lesson of the Elections. I wish the institutions of England, Ireland, and Scotland in this matter to be similar; and if we are going to have Sir Redvers Buller and military magistrates, then I suppose we had better secure simultaneity. The noble Lord knows very well that if it were attempted in Lancashire, where I live, or in Lanarkshire, a great constituency in which I have the honour to represent, things would become so hot for the Government that the attempt would have immediately to be abandoned. The practice does not correspond with our institutions or our customs. It is contrary to the principles of liberty, to which we justly attach so much importance. A great soldier is a good servant; but he is a bad master, and we should be very careful not to put him in that position. I object very strongly to what I take to be an evasion of the Constitution in Belfast. I think no soldier should have a double commission. I think no soldier should be a Justice of the Peace, so that he should read the Riot Act over the people whom he is going to shoot. Why have we these old restrictions, if it is not for the preservation of liberty? Why are we to part with them at a month's notice when we have the admission of the Chief of the Government that the civil condition in Kerry is such that it ought immediately to be overhauled, and when Members, at any rate on this side, are deeply impressed with the fact that the whole business is the result of bad government and bad institutions? I have been asked what I think Sir Redvers Buller ought to do when he goes to Kerry. That has been asked me in a Dublin journal, which gives the following lively account of what Sir Redvers Buller will do.

> "Sir Redvers Buller," it says, "will act against the 'Moonlighters' precisely as if they were rebels in arms against the Queen."

[*Ministerial cheers.*] Exactly; you cheer that. That is just an instance of the mess you will get into if you appoint military magistrates to exercise civil authority. What does this amount to? It simply amounts to suddenly and roughly, on an emergency, in a single county, setting up the doctrine of constructive treason. They find these marauders pursuing their nefarious practices, and then say they are to be treated as rebels against Her Majesty. I say nothing in their favour. They are persons against whom everyone on this side will gladly see the utmost penalties of the law enforced. But it is a bad beginning if hon. Gentlemen opposite are ready to cheer a wild statement of a wild newspaper correspondent, that Sir Redvers Buller, a General in Her Majesty's Army, is going to arrest "Moonlighters" and treat them as if they were rebels against Her Majesty. I was asked by the same authority whether I would have General Buller act in co-operation with the Land League? All I want to do to the Land League is to cashier it. I believe that good self-government in Ireland will cashier it. Our duty is to give Ireland self-government, which would put an end to all such outrages—to all such manners and customs —as the League is alleged to encourage. In the meantime, if we cannot do that at once, our duty is limited to making the civil system as perfect as we can make it with civil material. I venture to make an appeal to my right hon. Friends on the Front Opposition Benches. I know very well that, from their ex-official position, they must be in some embarrassment on such subjects; but the House heard, with great respect, the remarks made the other evening by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) upon this subject. Many cruel and injurious things were said about my right hon. Friend in that home of vulgar and un-Christian rancour—Belfast. But we who see him in the House know, and are deeply impressed with, the sensitiveness of mind with which he has addressed himself to all these problems. I am firmly pursuaded my right hon. Friend will never be deficient in the courage and sternness which are necessary for the enforcement of order in Ireland. But anyone who heard him the other night must have felt that there was a heaviness in his heart as he contemplated the dreadful conditions of life in the county of Kerry, and brought himself face to face with the issue—should he tolerate the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller in order that a better state of things might be introduced? I appreciate that, and honour my right hon. Friend for it; but I certainly think that, considering my right hon. Friend himself prophesied that the efforts of Sir Redvers Buller would not succeed, because they were not adapted to the case—I think that, although he may not be able to vote for this Motion, he may, at least, give some expression to his opinion that it is most adverse to the interest of Ireland, and dangerous to the Constitution of the country, that this new military practice should be introduced. It will not succeed. If it does succeed it will cost us some of our most justly prized traditions of civil freedom. Therefore, I think my right hon. Friend and others on the Front Benches are entitled, if they please, to indicate an opinion which will support the rank and file of their Party, and also support five-sixths of the Representatives of Ireland in the wish they have that the Constitution should still be preserved. [*Derisive laughter from Ministerial Benches.*] It may be a very laughable matter that the Representatives of five-sixths of a country should wish to preserve its Constitution; but I should prefer the meaning of those laughs to come articulately — that some hon. Gentleman should get up and put into terms, which will be reported to-morrow and which will be quoted at the next Election, any sentiment conflicting with that which I have expressed. This is a sensational proceeding. It will only gratify that baser sort of politicians who live upon the prejudices of the British nation against the Irish nation. What is worse, it will draw into the net of disaffection the whole of the county of Kerry and a very large portion of the rest of Ireland, without reference to the justice or propriety of Sir Redvers Buller's proceedings, simply on the ground that the enforcement of law in Ireland will be identified with the introduction of the military into a position in which they have no right to be. It is most essential, for the restoration of the moral sense of the people of Ireland, that the opinion of the House on this subject should be taken. An important part of the moral sense of any community is confidence in the law under which they lived; and the Government are going to degrade the law by placing its administration in the hands of a distinguished soldier. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] Yes; I adhere to that, not because I take any adverse view of Sir Redvers Buller's character, but because it is the very essence of law that it is degraded the moment the military element is introduced. The late Chief Justice Cockburn, who took such an interest in the question of martial law that he expressly took upon himself, out of the regular course, to go down to the Old Bailey and charge the Grand Jury in the Jamaica case, said, on that important occasion, that there were dangers more grave and threatening than even the duration of an insurrection, and that the eternal and immutable principles of justice could never be violated without peril to the true interests and well-being of a civilized community. I do not mean to suggest that the Chief Secretary would wilfully invade those eternal and immutable principles of justice; but I do say that the Government are introducing an enormous innovation when they militarize the *personnel* of justice. When they tamper with the civil integrity of the magistracy they open a door to the influx of the greatest evils. If you suffer the redcoats to administer the law, they will undoubtedly caricature it; and law can neither be caricatured nor perverted without at once endangering the stability and the happiness of the people.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. E. R. Russell.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. E. R. Russell) has made to the House a learned and, I must say, also an exhaustive speech. He holds strong opinions, and he has proposed to the House a certain course which it should adopt. In his opinion, the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller to Kerry is a startling innovation in our Constitution, a serious blow to civil and religious liberty, a wilful invasion of the immutable principles of justice, and other things of that serious kind. He holds these strong opinions, and he prophesies the most alarming results. He declares that the result will be that all Kerry will almost immediately take an active part in the proceedings of the "Moonlighters,"—[Mr. E. R. RUSSELL: I did not say that.]—and that all Ireland will very shortly be involved in a general conflagration. Now, Sir, I do not complain of the hon. Member holding these opinions; they are opinions he is perfectly entitled to hold and to express. What I want the House to do is to compare the opinions he holds with the course he suggests. What is the course which the hon. Member proposes? He proposes that the House of Commons should immediately adjourn. What will be the effect of that course upon Sir Redvers Buller or his appointment? Absolutely nothing. The House would adjourn if they agreed with the hon. Member, and, like the Emperor Titus, might exclaim that they had lost a day; but before the House met again Sir Redvers Buller would be well on his way to Kerry. That is the course which the hon. Gentleman proposes, in all seriousness, that we should adopt. May I point out to the hon. Member, with all respect, what I think would have been the proper course for him to pursue if he sincerely holds, as I am sure he does, these very strong and alarming opinions? Obviously he ought to have made a Motion in the form of an Amendment to the Address; because what would have been the results of this course if he had been successful? He would have put an end instantly, or, practically, instantaneously, to the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller; and, what is much more, I imagine that by his proposition he would have put an end to the Government responsible for that appointment. That is what I imagine would have been a practical, rational, and sensible course to pursue. In replying to the hon. Member, I intend to make my remarks as brief and as few as possible; but I must diverge, for one moment, to notice one special observation which fell from him. The hon. Member stated that he had the strongest possible objection to the employment of military officers in civil positions, and that he had a special objection to this particular appointment of Sir Redvers Buller on account of his military experience, and, to some extent, civil experience, having been drawn from his treatment of savages, and his relations with savage tribes in various quarters of the world. That was the opinion of the hon. Member, and it is an opinion of which I do not complain for one moment; it is not an opinion which I should share myself altogether; but it is the opinion of a sensitive and highly-strung, nervous organization. What surprised me most was this—that this opinion of the hon. Member was received with great cheering and approval on the Front Opposition Bench. Would the House be surprised to learn that this principle which the hon. Member has laid down, and for which I might say there is much to be said in the abstract, was violated in the grossest manner, not six months ago, by a right hon. Gentleman who sits opposite (Mr. Childers)? The right hon. Gentleman and his Friends cheered the hon. Member in his denunciation of the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller, a military officer, to a civil post. Are they aware that the late Government appointed Sir Charles Warren, an officer on the active list, liable to be recalled at any moment to military service, not to look after "Moonlighters" in Kerry, but after what I hope are the civilized inhabitants of London, curiously enough for much the same reason?

Mr. SEXTON (Sligo): Have you made him a magistrate?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Yes; he has magisterial power. Mark the analogy. The present Government are of opinion that there has possibly been some failure, some want of energy in the police arrangements in Kerry, and they select Sir Redvers Buller to detect whether there is any defect, and, if there is, to apply a remedy. That was precisely the reason why a distinguished officer, whose military experience has been gained in dealing with savage tribes, was selected by the late Government to superintend the police of the Metropolis. Therefore, when the hon. Member who made this Motion appealed to his own Leaders to support him on this Motion, he can hardly have been aware that by their conduct six months ago they are absolutely precluded from giving him the smallest support. But what I have to remark upon is this. This matter has been before the House for some days. I announced to the House the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller last Thursday. Nobody has censured the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller until now. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, I have not gathered from the hon. Member for Cork or any of his Friends that they considered the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller a matter for distinct censure or charge—["Oh, oh!"]—however, I learn it now for the first time. Certainly, nobody on the Front Opposition Bench has made it a matter of distinct censure or charge. Comments have been made; but they have not been comments which would lead me to suppose that such strong opinions existed about the appointment as apparently do now. But now it seems the appointment must instantly be brought under the consideration of the House, although the Motion can lead to no practical result. Why is this Motion made? The hon. Member calls the appointment a sensational appointment. I venture to think this is rather a sensational Motion. There are rumours floating about the House—rumours which have reached me from various sources, rumours which I think, if they are baseless and unfounded, should be publicly and authentically contradicted—as to the reason why this Motion has been brought forward. I am told the Motion has been brought forward in order to interrupt the regular proceedings of the House of Commons, and with the special object of intervening between the House and the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). It is certainly a most remarkable thing that all these strong feelings as to the nature of this appointment should have bubbled and boiled in the breast of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite for a whole week, and should only have exploded just on the day when the right hon. Gentleman is about to address the House. All I can say is that, if it is true, it is the greatest possible compliment to the right hon. Gentleman; it shows that his opponents fear so greatly the damaging character of the remarks which he is to make that there is no expedient which they will not resort to in order to annoy and embarrass and inconvenience the House which is anxious to hear him. The House is in possession of the fact of the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller. The policy of that appointment, we hold, cannot be debated in this way, because there is no definite issue before the House, and none whatever can be come to. I have to announce that Her Majesty's Government will take no part whatever in the discussion. We utterly decline to discuss the merits of the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller now. If hon. Gentlemen opposite wish to raise the question of the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller, let it be raised in a regular form. It can be raised in a regular manner—namely, by an Amendment to the Address; but in proceedings which I can only characterize as utterly irrational, in proceedings which I believe are only calculated to occupy in a most unprofitable manner the time of the House, and in proceedings which cannot possibly lead to any practical result and any public advantage, I, on behalf of the Government, decline to have the smallest part or concern.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): The last announcement of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I think, comes singularly from one who used to avail himself to an extent that we considered a great abuse of Motions for Adjournment, and who raised discussions upon every possible subject to the interruption of important Public Business. I have never myself taken part in these Motions for Adjournment. I objected when the Rule was originally made, and I objected in a recent Committee to that practice. I have never done what the whole of the Front Ministerial Bench has done more than once—risen to support a Motion for Adjournment upon the most trivial question. I remember perfectly well a Motion on some peculiar view entertained upon the Income Tax by an hon. Gentleman much respected in this House. It was stated to be a matter of urgent public importance that this question should be discussed to the interruption of the whole Business of the House of Commons; and every Gentleman who was then upon the Front Opposition Bench rose to support that Motion. Therefore, for the noble Lord to say he refuses on a Question of Adjournment to discuss the question brought forward is practically to fly in the face of the Rules of the House, and of the practice of hon. Gentlemen among whom he sits. There is another remark of the noble Lord to which I may advert. The noble Lord says that if this Motion for Adjournment were carried it would have no effect upon the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller. I venture to think it would have a very great effect, because I think it would probably adjourn the mission of Sir Redvers Buller. As to the substance of this matter, I think it is one upon which we ought to speak with very great caution and very great reserve. I only wish that that course had been adopted from the first by Her Majesty's Government. I think that if the language, the very moderate language, employed by the Chief Secretary to-night had been used in introducing this appointment to the House there would not have been that anxiety—I may say that reasonable anxiety—in the public mind which has been produced by this appointment. I have only a question or two to ask with reference to that explanation, in order to show that I should not be dissatisfied with it. The great mischief which has been done is due to the tone, the language, and the spirit in which this appointment was announced to both Houses of Parliament. It was because the noble Lord chose to make of it a flourish of military trumpets, because he endeavoured to produce upon the public mind an impression that there was going to be something like that, which I confess I heard with astonishment and regret cheered from the Conservative Benches, and that Sir Redvers Buller was going to deal with the people of Kerry as if they were rebels. [An hon. MEMBER: Moonlighters.] I do not care who. Of course, Her Majesty's Government repudiate any such doctrine as that with indignation if they are fit to be British Ministers. Why, if they were murderers, you cannot shoot them down without trial, of course, unless you have a law to that effect; but you have not yet proposed it. Well, what does it mean treating ignorant men like rebels in arms? It means shooting them down without trial. Of course, that is not what the Government mean. If they meant anything like it they would deserve to be dismissed from their places. They do not mean anything of the kind. They have said that they have sent Sir Redvers Buller, not as an officer of the Army to deal with rebels in arms. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) has said exactly the opposite. He said Sir Redvers Buller is to be sent as a Civil Magistrate acting strictly according to the existing law. So far, of course, that is satisfactory. But how was it spoken of by the noble Lord in introducing it to the House on the first night of the meeting of Parliament? If he had told us that Sir Redvers Buller, who was a distinguished officer, was going to become a police magistrate that would have been different. I must refer, however, to the extraordinary, and—if I may say so without offence — the most shallow fallacy of the noble Lord in comparing this appointment with that of Sir Charles Warren, who has no military authority in London. He has no military capacity whatever; it is in abeyance. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: So it is here.] If he remains on the active list, which I do not know, he cannot give a single order to a single soldier, or if he did so he would not be fit for his office. Is that to be the position of Sir Redvers Buller? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Yes.] Can he give no orders to the military in Kerry? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Yes.] Ah, then your comparison fails. [*Home Rule cheers.*] It is, I repeat, a most wretched fallacy. I gather from the noble Lord's attitude that he agrees that Sir Redvers Buller is to have no military authority in Kerry.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he would be in the same position as any other magistrate.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: If that be so, what was the meaning of the cheers from the Conservatives on the other side of the House? I am sure that if that had been understood it would, very probably, have disposed of this Motion. Let us see what the language of the noble Lord was on the first night of the Session. It was very different. The noble Lord said—

> "Her Majesty's Government have decided to appoint a special military officer . . . to the command of the disturbed districts, with such powers as we believe will enable him to organize arrangements for the restoration of order."

I do not think it unnatural for us to have supposed that those were to be extraordinary powers.

> "And for the cessation of the reign of terror which there prevails. This general officer will be directly responsible to my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary; and the officer whom Her Majesty's Government have selected, and who has consented to undertake the duty, is Sir Redvers Buller."

If instead of that the noble Lord had said that they were going to send Sir Redvers Buller as a magistrate to Kerry, I doubt whether it would have been received with so much enthusiasm, or created so much alarm on this side of the House. It is certainly of the spirit of our institutions in recent times that the distinction should be carefully preserved between the civil action of the Civil Magistrates and the action of the military officer when it was necessary that the military officer should be called in to support the civil power. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) the other night referred rather in a spirit of taunt to my action with reference to the disturbances in Skye. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No.] I am glad to hear that. What was done in that case? I took care that the military should be used as a secondary force, the police being put in the forefront. I warned the authorities in Scotland that the moment the police or magistrates were withdrawn, the military would be withdrawn also, so that there should be no possibility of the military acting as a separate authority. If you think a distinguished military officer will make you an excellent magistrate, I have not a word to say against that; but then I think it most desirable that while so acting you should dissever him from his military character. I want to know, in the first place, is Sir Redvers Buller, when he becomes a Civil Magistrate, to remain a Military Commandant in that district? Does he supersede all the other magistrates in the district? And, in the next place, what is to be his relation to the Inspector General of the Constabulary in Ireland, because on that depends very much what would be the effect of his appointment on the Irish Constabulary? I heard with satisfaction from the noble Lord the strong and sound language he spoke out in defence of the Irish Constabulary in Belfast. I think the attacks made upon them have been most mischievous and most dangerous. But in what we do we must be very careful not to shake the organization of the Irish Constabulary. Though military in character it is a civil force, and if you import into it a military command you will very seriously affect the character of the Irish Constabulary, and if you import a person into a district of Ireland independent of, and superior to, the Inspector General, you very seriously shake his authority. Therefore I think we ought to be told what will be the effect of the appointment, if it is to be independent of the Inspector General of the Constabulary. If the Constabulary in Kerry are to be subject to the authority of the Inspector

General, exactly as any other constabulary in Ireland, then I think the objections taken are very much removed. I think it was a great pity in a matter of this kind this was not carefully explained, so as to remove misapprehension and alarm either in England or in Ireland. I do not want to use any inflammatory language —there has been too much on the other side—but it is very natural that an appointment of this kind, announced in this way, should cause commotion and comment. It is the natural consequence of the language used, especially by Lord Salisbury, with reference to the Irish people. ["Oh, oh!"] You cry "Oh, oh!" Do you think it has been forgotten that Lord Salisbury compared Irish people to Hottentots? I think in these matters it is desirable that an appointment of this kind should have been cautiously, carefully, and prudently introduced. All I can say is, that if I am correct in the interpretation which I have placed on the explanations given by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary — that Sir Redvers Buller stands in no other position and authority than that of an ordinary Divisional Magistrate in that district—I do not feel called upon to object, and I should not be justified in objecting, to the course the Government have taken. They incur a great responsibility. They are responsible for the preservation of peace in Ireland, and they ought to take the course which they think best for that purpose. But the noble Lord has entered into some speculations as to the reason why this Motion has been brought forward. I happened to be in the country last night, and did not hear that the Motion was to be brought on until I read something in the newspapers this morning to that effect. The noble Lord has made a most singular suggestion, not very dignified, coming as it did from the Leader of the House, as to the object of this Motion. I quite feel that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) deserves all the compliments which the noble Lord has paid him. But really I think the noble Lord was laying on the flattery a little too thick when he resorted to such an explanation for a Motion of this character. The idea of a Motion of this kind being brought forward for any such purpose as that suggested seems to me so utterly preposterous as to be unworthy of notice. I do not see how the Motion is going to prevent my right hon. Friend from addressing the House, and therefore it is hardly worthy of the noble Lord to have used such an argument as that to us. I hope this debate will not be long continued, though I think the attitude which the Government have taken in the matter is one which is rather provoking. If the noble Lord had been wise enough to have followed the example of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and had given moderate explanations in this matter calculated to remove the anxiety felt, it would have been more in the interests of Public Business. I hope, however, in these circumstances, it will be considered that we will take rather the version of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary than the "flare up" of the noble Lord as to the real meaning of this action. That being so, I hope hon. Members will now give the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham an opportunity of addressing the House.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) said, that, in his opinion, the matter would well bear a little further examination. It seemed to him as if the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) attached very little importance to the discussion that had been raised, for he had intimated that the decision of the House upon it would be treated as waste paper. He (Mr. J. E. Ellis) did not think, by using such language as that, the noble Lord was likely to commend himself to the House as a worthy occupant of the position of its Leader. He (Mr. J. E. Ellis) most indignantly repudiated the suggestion of the noble Lord as to the reason why this Motion had been brought forward. He and the hon. Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow (Mr. E. R. Russell) were primarily responsible for the subject being brought under the notice of the House; and neither he nor his hon. Friend was desirous of shirking the responsibility of raising a question which went to the root of our civil and religious liberty. The reason why the question had been raised at that juncture was because they learnt from the Press that Sir Redvers Buller was to proceed on his Irish mission to-morrow. The question was, therefore, an urgent one. He thought that the thanks of the House were due to the Mover of the Motion for raising a discussion on so important a subject, and also for having afforded the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity of explaining the relations between military and civil law in regard to this matter. The noble Lord had suggested that the Motion was brought forward to delay the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain). But it had certainly no such object, though there were some who thought that right hon. Gentleman was not quite the important personage that the noble Lord seemed to consider him. The right hon. Gentleman had a very small handful of followers in that House, and his position in the country was ridiculously exaggerated. He could, however, assure the noble Lord and the Member for West Birmingham that there was no thought of the convenience of the right hon. Gentleman, or of the time at which he was likely to address the House, when it was arranged to bring forward this Motion. He wished most emphatically to express his objection to the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller. He wished, in the most emphatic terms, to express his detestation of the sort of crime and outrage which appeared still to prevail in the county of Kerry. And, further, he would repeat in that House what he had said on the platform, a regret that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and some of his Friends should have occasionally used language which was not of a soothing character, and he thought that what they had said in times gone by would have been better left unsaid. But he was ready to make allowance for the position in which they were placed, and he acknowledged the moderation that had characterized the speeches of hon. Members below the Gangway since the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian made his offer. The matter with which they were dealing went to the root of our Constitutional liberties, and there were special reasons at the present moment why they should look further into it. The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) said, in answer to a Question from him (Mr. J. E. Ellis), that he was happy to inform him that there was no likelihood of any disturbance in the Midland or Northern counties. He represented a Midland and Northern county, and knew the state of feeling there. He deprecated the fact that a paragraph should be put in *The Times* and other papers of such a provocative nature as that to which he had referred. It had also been stated in the Press that there had been a meeting upstairs of military Members of the House. He was sometimes surprised at the frequency with which, in replying from the Front Bench——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask the hon. Member to keep strictly to the Question of the appointment of a military officer in Ireland.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS said, he bowed to the Speaker's ruling, and hoped that the House would understand that the offence was due to inexperience. They really were not at all surprised at the appointment of General Buller, which was the outcome of the policy which had the authority of the Prime Minister, who, when he sat below the Gangway of this House as Lord Robert Cecil, speaking on the subject of Ireland, said—

> "You must teach the Irish people to fear the law before you will get them to obey it."

That was precisely where the point of divergence between hon. Members opposite and the Liberal Party came in. That was the law of fear, and the rule of fear. Speaking at the Mansion House, on the 11th of August, Lord Salisbury had said—

> "It is our duty to restore in Ireland that social order, the loss of which is the only just cause of discontent which the people have."

["Hear, hear!"] That, again, was a point where they took issue. They said the loss of social order was not the only just cause of discontent. The Prime Minister meant what he said, and generally said what he meant.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry again to have to interrupt the hon. Gentleman; but he is not confining himself to the Question.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS said, he humbly apologized. The points which required further elucidation were the precise relation which this military officer would have in the civil government; was he to be a military man, or a Divisional Magistrate? Was he to have power to call the military to his aid. There had been, for all time, the most extreme jealousy of the interference of the military with the civil power. One of the most vital parts of our Constitution was the absolute distinction it drew between the civil and military powers. The Army itself existed only by consent of the House of Commons given yearly, and only for a period of 12 months. Anyone who doubted, or did not fully appreciate, the extreme jealousy of military rule or operations known to our Constitution should read the great Charge of Chief Justice Cockburn in the case of the "Queen *v.* Nelson and Brand," arising out of the Jamaica riots of 1865. What they wanted to know was, whether General Buller was to be a general or a magistrate? They were sent to those Benches to perform a grave and Constitutional duty—to uphold the rights and privileges of their countrymen, as handed down by their forefathers. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his place, had told them that the Government would not condescend to argue the matter. They were not disappointed at that announcement; as, probably, the explanation was because the Government could not find reasons for the course they proposed to pursue. The public would judge between the two parties. They had heard something of a final and irrevocable verdict of the country. One verdict, at all events, had been finally and irrevocably given—that was, that Ireland should and must be treated in a different manner to that in which she had been treated during the last century; and he did not think that in the appointment of General Buller a step was being taken towards the satisfaction of the wishes and aspirations of the Irish people.

MR. WADDY (Lincolnshire, Brigg) said, he desired to know whether the Government would undertake to lay on the Table the instructions and orders that had been given to General Buller? Would they let the House know definitely and distinctly what he was going to do and how he was going to do it? At present they had no distinct statement of what was equally important—namely, of what he was not going to do. Was he going to supersede County Court Judges? He must have civil power in that case. Was he to try common civil cases? Because he thought if they looked they would find that the statement now made was totally different from that previously made with reference to the appointment both in this House and "elsewhere." It was now a purely civil appointment; but when it was first announced it was almost entirely a military one. They had been told by an eminent authority that it was the "absolute determination of the Government to use to the utmost all the existing powers of the ordinary law and all the powers of the existing Military and Police Forces." It followed that General Buller was to have the entire control, not simply as a Civil Magistrate, of the Military as well as the Police Forces. They were told, on the one hand, that the opposite side were not going to have coercion; but, on the other, that they were going practically to introduce martial law. He wanted to know the distinction. He wanted to know was it to be coercion, or was it to be martial law? It was not worth while spending many words over if the Government would only have the kindness to give them the information; but it was worth while spending a good many words about if the Government would not instruct them.

MR. H. J. WILSON (York, W.R., Holmfirth) said, he desired to ascertain the grounds upon which the Government had selected General Buller. He believed the gallant General was a distinguished officer in the Zulu War. There was no doubt he distinguished himself on that occasion. But how did he distinguish himself? He was chiefly distinguished as the leader of a body of Irregular Cavalry that operated in the war; and the operations of that body were, he believed, very irregular even in war itself. He wanted to give only two illustrations of the spirit and style in which General Buller carried out the instructions and conducted the operations intrusted to him by quoting very briefly from letters of Mr. Archibald Forbes, the war correspondent, who, it was understood, was a great admirer of General Buller. In one letter Mr. Forbes said—

> "Here Buller joined us, but he was not very gay before he had taken his full toll of Zulu blood."

In a subsequent letter occurred the following:—

> "Colonel Buller three days ago took out a strong detachment of that strange but wonderfully efficient force of indiscriminate ruffians who serve under him, under the name of Irre-

> gular Cavalry, on a two days' expedition. . . . Reaching the bed of the White Umvolosi on the first evening, by daylight on the second morning he engaged in the annexation of cattle. The people in charge of these cattle made a feeble resistance and were not warriors, but policy demanded that a certain number of them should die for the sake of creating an impression, and about a dozen of them fell under the fire of Buller's men."

Now, he believed the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was at that time Colonial Secretary, so that he must have been aware of the character of these proceedings; and he should like very much to know whether it was for such services as those that General Buller had been selected for appointment to the present post?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Sir, I should have taken no part in this discussion, because I had, as I think, already answered the questions which the right hon. Gentleman and other speakers have asked as to the terms of Sir Redvers Buller's appointment, but for the outrageous attack — for I can characterize it by no other epithet—which has been made upon that gallant and distinguished officer by the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. H. J. Wilson). It is perfectly true that I was Colonial Secretary at the time General Buller was engaged in active operations in the Zulu War; and it is also true, and there are many in this House who, knowing that gallant General well, will, in this, confirm me when I say that it is also true that General Buller is as humane as he is brave. And to bring forward such charges against General Buller in this House, on the word of a newspaper correspondent, without the faintest shadow of proof, is, I will venture to say, an outrage on the name and fame of that gallant officer. Sir, we have selected General Buller to go to Kerry because we believe from his experience that he will act constitutionally, justly, humanely, uprightly, and firmly in the task with which he is intrusted. I have stated what his appointment is in answer to the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. E. R. Russell), who, I think, would hardly have brought forward this Motion if he had previously considered the terms of my answer. I stated that General Buller had a civil appointment in Kerry, and not a military command. [Mr. WADDY: What civil appointment?] I stated, in answer to a previous Question of the hon. Member for Glasgow, that General Buller's civil appointment would give him the powers that are possessed in Ireland by other Divisional Magistrates, and I believe that those powers will be sufficient to enable him to do that work of re-organization for the detection and prevention of crime with which he is charged. The difference between General Buller's appointment and theirs is this—that his is a temporary mission, while theirs are permanent appointments. General Buller, having regard to the circumstances—the special and difficult circumstances—of this case, and to the fact that he may have to act at very short notice, is expected largely to act for himself; and he is only to report to and communicate to me in order to insure rapidity of action in any direction in which he may think it desirable to move. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) asked a question as to the relations of General Buller with the Royal Irish Constabulary. I stated the precise official relations between General Buller and the Inspector General of Constabulary the other night. The right hon. Gentleman my Predecessor in Office (Mr. John Morley) knows very well that Captain Plunket, at this moment Divisional Magistrate of Kerry, is not under the authority of the Inspector General—no more is General Buller. But I should like to read what the Inspector General, without any previous communication from me, has telegraphed with reference to General Buller's appointment. He says—

> "General Buller will receive from myself and all the Royal Irish Constabulary officers the most hearty support, and it will be a great pleasure to me to co-operate with him to the fullest extent of my ability and power."

DR. COMMINS (Roscommon, S.) said, no answer had been given to the question whether General Buller would have the whole civil and military command in the counties of Clare and Kerry? They had been told that General Buller's appointment was a civil one; but in regard to the military part of it the Treasury Bench would not say whether he still held it or not. He thought that the Government should tell the House whether General Buller had retired from his military command, and also whether, by his civil appointment, he would take precedence of the Lords Lieutenant of Kerry and Clare, who in that capacity made out the Commission of the Peace for their counties, and whether he would be above the Sheriffs of those counties? If he held both these appointments, as a magistrate he would be able to read the Riot Act, and thereupon as a soldier he would have the command of the troops, and could order them to fire on the people if he thought right to do so without any control from the civil authority. If he was so minded, he could act exactly as he acted in Zululand; and that was the position which the Treasury Bench were trying to cloak. They knew that soldiers might be imported into Clare and Kerry and quartered upon the farmers, innkeepers, and others, who would have to maintain them; and he would like to know whether, under these two appointments, General Buller would not have the right of free quartering upon the people? He thought that the only precedent for such an appointment as this was the appointment by Cromwell of his Courts of Major Generals as the first step towards the despotism which he soon afterwards established over this country. Those Courts had been extended by Cromwell to Ireland when he had perfected the system in this country, and they had become known as Cromwell's slaughter-houses. He only hoped that the proposed proceedings would not get a title of that kind. He thought that the House should express a strong opinion upon the danger of such an appointment as this, which would only aggravate the evils which existed in those counties. He did not believe that the noble Lord would treat the opinion of the Irish people, as expressed by their Representatives, in the cavalier way he had in his speech. The appointment he held was an unconstitutional one; and he thought, in view of the feeling expressed by Members of the House, that the Government should withdraw from it. He reminded hon. Members on the opposite Benches that the Irish Police were really as much a portion of the Forces of the Crown as the Royal Guards, being directly under the authority of the Crown, and officered by the Crown, and were even called the Royal Irish Constabulary. He deprecated as much as any-one the crime which existed, and he would like to see crime put down; but crime must be put down by the even-handed force of the law. The law was strong enough to put down crime by regular means; and crime could not be put down by irregular ways. Such irregular ways only gave excuse to people who committed crime; at all events, it got sympathy for them when otherwise they would have no sympathy whatever. He would also like to know the particular fitness of Sir Redvers Buller. Had he any skill as a policeman? Did he know the people of the district, or was he acquainted with the habits of the conspirators? He hoped the Mover of the Adjournment would take a division upon his Motion, and that the division would be such that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) would be forced to respect the opinion of the House.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) said, whatever might have been thought of this question when it was first started, there could now be no doubt whatever that one of the gravest Constitutional questions had been raised at a very critical moment. The proceedings of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-night had filled him with indignation. A question of urgency had been submitted to the Speaker, and a large body of hon. Members had risen to endorse the view that the question was urgent. Under these circumstances, what was the treatment to which the Leader of the House subjected a large body of its Members? After a speech, in which he delivered himself of his own view, he intimated that the Government would have nothing more to say upon the subject, whatever other information might be laid before the House, or whatever opinion might be expressed. He regarded that as a most unconstitutional and most offensive treatment of the House. He believed they might look through the history of the Leadership of the House, whether under Liberal or Tory Governments, and they would fail to find an instance in which the House had been treated with such contempt. The foolishness and short-sightedness of the course taken by the noble Lord had already been made patent, for after his distinct declaration that, however long this discussion might be continued, no Member of the Government would take part in it, the next most important Member of the Government, the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), rose and expressed his surprise that the character of General Buller should be attacked, and that quotations should be made from newspaper correspondents as to the gallant General's antecedents. In this country, with regard to the conduct of military and naval officers in foreign countries, or in distant parts of the Empire, we were obliged, in the first instance, to depend—and very often we had to depend exclusively—upon the reports of independent witnesses writing for the Press for an account of what was happening in distant countries where our troops were engaged. While it might suit the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland to try to maintain the character of Sir Redvers Buller, the people of this country would look with anxiety and alarm at the antecedents of this English General, because they had been unable to learn from any Member of the Government that this English General had any other qualifications for the post to which he had been appointed. They were still in the dark as to an important part of General Buller's functions. They were to be told that General Buller was to be clothed with civil authority, and made a Civil Magistrate; but he was to be responsible to no one except the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland. What they wanted to know was, whether he had been stripped of his military power? Was he to be invested with two authorities? Did he go as a double-barrelled gun, having both civil authority and military power in his hands? They were told that his appointment as a magistrate was only temporary. But how temporary? How did they know that the course the Government were pursuing, instead of extinguishing lawlessness or mitigating it, might not increase it? He remembered the time when there were riots in the North of England. The people then had this great safeguard, that the military force could not be employed except upon the authority of the magistrates known in the locality. If the substitution of civil authority for military authority had been proposed in the North of England, the people would have risen in arms against it. The noble Lord had suggested—and it showed the spirit in which he was disposed to treat hon. Members of the House—that this discussion had been originated in order to offer embarrassment to the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), and so prevent the House hearing him. Those who carried their noses low caught more disagreeable smells than other people. But the motive which the noble Lord attributed to many hon. Members of the House was one which had not entered into their thoughts for a moment. The Motion was brought forward because it was found out that Sir Redvers Buller was immediately going to Ireland. Whether the modern relationship between the noble Lord and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had placed the noble Lord in possession of special information he did not know, but the noble Lord was in error. He could only augur the worst results as to the Leadership of the House from the way in which the noble Lord had conducted the Business of the House that evening.

Colonel BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince) said, he knew General Sir Redvers Buller well. He was a man of remarkable ability and of tried administrative capacity and humane man, and as attached to the Constitution as any hon. Gentleman in that House; and, in his opinion, the Government had intrusted the administration of the law in Kerry to most capable hands. He could assure the House that if Sir Redvers Buller found that any landlord in Kerry was really abusing his power and authority he was just the man who would not be slow to tell him so. Therefore he sincerely trusted and appealed to hon. Gentlemen, if they wished that the state of anarchy which prevailed in Kerry should be put down without bloodshed or harshness, not to interfere with the arrangements which the Government had made, and to refrain from doing anything to prevent General Buller from carrying out and discharging his difficult duty, a duty which would probably be as unpalatable to him as it would be to any military officer or any man to whom it might be entrusted.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said, he had been strongly impressed with—and he agreed with the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) — the impropriety of the tone the Leader of the House had adopted with reference to the subject before it. The noble Lord amused the House and they had a hearty laugh over it; but he could assure the House that this appointment was not a subject for laughter to the people of Ireland. It was possible, it was likely, that before Sir Redvers Buller left Kerry it would be found to be no subject for laughter for the people of England. They had in Ireland precedents for proceedings like this, although they might not have had them in English history for a long time past; but he challenged any hon. Member in the House to look back to the history of Ireland and to see what were the results which followed in any single instance in which a military officer was employed to take a similar charge, and what had been done over and over again might be attended with similar results. Disturbances were aggravated, the people were possessed with fury, and martial law was rigorously enforced. It was such proceedings and the action of the military officers and the memories which these had left behind in the minds of the Irish people which made Ireland such a trouble to this country to-day. It had been said that they were sending Sir Redvers Buller because he was known to be an able and intelligent man. Were there no men of that description among the civil servants of the Crown in Ireland, who knew, moreover, something of the country, and in the great establishment of magistrates of Ireland men who had much special training in the repression of crime in Ireland, that they could not be got, but that the Government must go to the military and select this hero from Zululand? How, he asked, would the people of Kerry take the appointment? That was an important question, involving an objection sufficient to condemn the appointment in the minds of the people of Ireland, and he contended that their opinion was entitled to some respect on this matter. Englishmen ought to ask themselves the question how the people of Kerry would regard the appointment. Would the people look upon the appointment as an honest effort on the part of the Government to put down crime and restore order? Nothing of the sort. They would look upon Sir Redvers Buller as a man who, to use the words of the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury), was sent to take command of the district in the interests of the landlords, and to put down by whatever force might be necessary every disorder which interfered with the exterminating policy being carried on there. Let them consider what possible reasons could be alleged in favour of the appointment of such a man as Sir Redvers Buller, or the appointment of any military man at all. What was the work that lay before him when he went down to Kerry? Would he find any force in arms against Her Majesty? Could any hon. Member of the House state a single instance of open resistance to the law in Kerry for the last 10 years? He defied anyone to do so. There had been no such resistance, and he defied the Government to bring forward a single case which General Buller would have to deal with which was not connected with a secret association, the offspring of a process of the worst oppression and tyranny which had ever been practised upon a civilized people. The people of Kerry had been tortured and oppressed by their landlords to such an extent that, although they dreaded and hated the "Moonlighters," they dreaded and hated the landlords more, and it was because of that that the people did not inform against "Moonlighters," and assist to bring them to justice, even when they could. The work to be done in Kerry was not to put down resistance to the law, because there was none, but to break up a secret association. Would any man in that House tell him that Sir Redvers Buller was by training and experience as a soldier the man to deal with a secret association? It was detective work that was required, and if General Buller was sent to Kerry because he was a good detective that only showed that he was not fit to be a soldier. The training of a soldier was rather calculated to incapacitate him for the work required. What was wanted in Kerry to put down this secret association was fair law and justice. Do justice to the people of Ireland and the "Moonlighters" would be heard of no more. He supposed General Buller would have power to call out the military, and to have military patrols in Kerry. Probably one of his first acts would be to have the roads patrolled at night by military. What security, then, was there that Sir Redvers Buller would not consider that every young man found outside his father's door at night in Kerry was a "Moonlighter," and that he should be treated as a rebel in arms? ["Oh!" *and cheers.*] With ominous cheers from the Ministerial Benches the statement had been received that he would deal with the "Moonlighter" as he would with a rebel found in arms. [*Renewed cheers.*] Again the statement was cheered, and by that cheer they mean to say that every young man in the county of Kerry who chose to go outside the door of his father's house after dark was to be shot down like a rebel. ["No, no!"] Everything was left to the discretion of General Buller. What power would General Buller have under the Act passed against his (Mr. Dillon's) repeated protest in that House? Under the Arms Act, he might billet soldiers in any house in Kerry. The power of billeting might be turned into a most cruel instrument of oppression. Under this Act, he would have power to break into any house in the county of Kerry under the pretence of searching for arms, and this power again might be used for purposes of oppression. One of the chief things that had embittered the Irish people against the administration of the English law was the unfair way in which the Arms Act had been enforced in different parts of the country. Thus, in the South of Ireland, people had been sentenced to three months' imprisonment under the provision of that Act for the illegal possession of arms, while no sentences whatever had been imposed upon the inhabitants of Belfast for similar offences, although many of them were proved to have not only illegally possessed arms, but to have used them for the purpose of firing upon the Queen's troops. This new appointment was no laughing or joking matter in Ireland. To the Irish people it was a most serious matter, and it was a matter well worthy the consideration of the House. The result of the appointment would be twofold in Kerry—it would increase and intensify the character of the disturbances, and consequently would increase and intensify the hatred that exists among the people to English law, while it would inspirit the Kenmares and the landlords of Kerry to carry on their campaign in Kerry. For 25 years before this exterminating campaign commenced in January, and 1,600 people had been sent to the hedges and ditches, there was no "Moonlighting" and no outrage.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he must remind the hon. Member that the state of Kerry was not the Question before the House, but the appointment of a military officer.

Mr. DILLON said, he bowed to the ruling of the Speaker, but thought his remarks were pertinent, as Kerry was the district to which General Buller was to be sent. He wished to know whether General Buller would have the power of calling into the district extra military and extra police; whether the extra police would be charged on the people; whether he would have the power of quartering troops on the people of the district; whether he would have the power of ordering arrests; whether he would have power to examine prisoners in secrecy; and whether he would have any control over the magistrates in the infliction of sentences? These were questions the Government had not answered at all, and yet they were questions of the utmost importance to the people of the district. When Mr. Clifford Lloyd was in control of the district he surrounded whole villages with a large force of military and police, and arrested everyone whom he thought capable of doing any mishief. He held his Courts secretly in barns and other buildings, and excluded the Press, so that it was impossible to know what transpired except from the prisoners themselves. He refused bail in cases where the accused were entitled to it. He (Mr. Dillon) wished to know whether this sort of terrorism was to be carried out now, and whether General Buller was to order the magistrates of the country to refuse bail for certain classes of offences, where, in their own discretion, they would accept bail? He wished to know whether he was to have the power to direct the magistrates as to the infliction of sentences under the Arms Act? He could not but believe that the Government were only training General Buller for the Coercion Act which they were about to pass subsequently—that it was not Kerry they had in their minds, but the whole of Ireland. If General Buller had any reputation, he was most likely to leave it behind him among the "Moonlighters" of Kerry. General Buller had a tough task before him. He had won a reputation, and not a very enviable one, in Zululand; and he would have better consulted his name, his honour as a soldier, and the character of the uniform he wore, if he had declined to place himself in the position of head detective to break up a secret society.

Mr. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said, he would like to point out that the Government were responsible for the administration of law and order; and the Constitution of the country conferred upon the Government certain powers, among others that of appointing officials. On this occasion the Government were not proposing to ask Parliament for any special or exceptional powers. If they were, he could have understood why such a discussion should have arisen. But as they did not ask exceptional powers, the Government were responsible, in carrying out their powers, to keep within the limits of the law and the Constitution. The Irish need have no fear of any illegal act on the part of General Buller or the Government, because the Government, although they were the Government, could not go beyond the limits of the Constitution, and could not confer any rights or powers which the law did not confer upon themselves. That being so, he thought hon. Members on his side of the House must see the very inconvenient position in which they were placing right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench. Some day — and he cared not how soon in certain circumstances — the Gentlemen forming the Front Opposition Bench now might be occupying again the Front Bench opposite; and if such a question arose, would they not be the first to say—Why should the House of Commons interfere in a matter which the law had delegated to the Executive Government of the country, and for which the Executive of the country was alone responsible? He, therefore, held that so long as the Executive simply acted on the law as at present existing, so long as they did not come to Parliament and ask for exceptional powers, the duty of the House of Commons was to leave the administration of the law in the hands of those who, by the Constitution, were responsible for it. He felt that they would be adopting a precedent which would be most inconvenient and likely to seriously embarrass the procedure of any future Liberal Government if they interfered in this matter.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said, he had been a long time associated with the county of Kerry. He knew something of the history of the people, and of the causes which had led to the necessity for the appointment of Sir Redvers Buller. He should not be discharging his duty as an Irish Member if he did not enter his protest against the policy which Her Majesty's Government were pursuing in taking the administration of the law in Kerry and Clare out of the hands of the men who had ordinarily administered it in those counties, who knew those counties and knew the circumstances of those counties, and who had been associated with the administration of the law there for years, and placing it in the hands of a man who had never yet set foot in Ireland. What explanation did Her Majesty's Government give of the manner in which they cashiered Captain Plunket, the Divisional Magistrate who had charge of Kerry and Clare? One of the reasons why they (the Irish Members) objected to this appointment, regarded it with the gravest suspicion, and thought it dangerous to the peace of Ireland and likely to exasperate the people was that, while Sir Redvers Buller would exercise civil powers, he would continue to hold his military appointment. It was believed that Sir Redvers Buller had not been sought by the Government to go to Ireland; but that in pursuance of his military instruction, and in obedience to the gossip which he heard in London, he had volunteered his services for a duty which must bring him into conflict with the people. So far as he (Mr. T. C. Harrington) and his Colleagues were concerned, if Sir Redvers Buller went to Ireland with the intention of only addressing himself to the extermination of "Moonlighting" in Kerry, to restore social order, and if he discharged that duty in an impartial manner, he would have their heartiest support; but his (Mr. T. C. Harrington's) knowledge of the administration of the law in that country forced him to the conviction that when men of that class went to the country they placed themselves in connection with the local magistrates, who were all landlords. No one had more reason than he and his Colleagues to sympathize with any genuine effort to extirpate crime. At risk and danger to themselves they had endeavoured to grapple with it. But the policy of the Government was not of that character. He warned the Chief Secretary that he had, to some extent, been made a dupe in this business, and that while he was to be responsible to him, Sir Redvers Buller was really sent to Ireland with wholly undefined powers—for the Government were not even agreed as to the powers he should possess—and for a purpose which the Chief Secretary did not know. The real men who had been at the root of all the evil, and who, during the last six years, had promoted outrage and crime by evicting more than 1,000 tenants, and who bred discontent in that part of the country, he would tell the Government were not the agitators, but the landlord class.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 146; Noes 241: Majority 95.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Acland, A. H. D.
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Sir G.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blane, A.
Borlase, W. C.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Burt, T.
Buxton, S. C.
Byrne, G. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Chance, P. A.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Cobb, H. P.
Commins, A.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Craven, J.
Crawford, D.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Crilly, D.
Crossley, E.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. H. G.
Esslemont, P.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Flower, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Gane, J. L.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gray, E. D.
Harrington, E.
Harrington, T. C.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Howell, G.
Hunter, W. A
Illingworth, A.
Jacoby, J. A.
James, C. H.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, C. S.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Lawson, H. L. W.
Leahy, J.
Leamy, E.
Lockwood, F.
M'Arthur, W. A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, Dr. R.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Laren, W. G. B.

Mahony, P.
Mappin, F. T.
Marum, E. M.
Mason, S.
Mayne, T.
Molloy, B. C.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Kerry)
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Doherty, J. E.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Pease, A. E.
Pickard, B.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Potter, T. B.
Power, P. J.
Power, R.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Reynolds, W. J.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J. B.
Roe, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rountree, J.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Sheil, E.
Shirley, W. S.
Simon, Sir J.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Tuite, J.
Waddy, S. D.
Wallace, R.
Warmington, C. M.
Watson, T.
Watt, H.
Wayman, T.
Will, J. S.
Wilson, H. J.
Wright, C.
Yeo, F. A.

TELLERS.

Ellis, J. E.
Russell, E. R.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ambrose, W.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baillie-Cochrane, hon. C. W. A. N.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Bartley, G. C. T.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beadel, W. J.
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Chamberlain, R.
Charrington, S.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Commerell, Adml. Sir J. E.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corbett, A. C.
Corbett, J.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon, G.
Donkin, R. S.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hon. Sir W. H.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elliot, Sir G.
Elliot, G. W.

Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Farquharson, H. R.
Fellowes, W. H.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Finch, G. H.
Finlay, R. B.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fry, L.
Fulton, J. F.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Grimston, Viscount
Grotrian, F. B.
Grove, Sir T. F.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Lord E.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hastings, G. W.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Herbert, hon. S.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hingley, B.
Hoare, S.
Hobhouse, H.
Hodge, R. T. H.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, rt. hn. J. G.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Ker, R. W. B.
Kerans, F. H.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lea, T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lethbridge, Sir R.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, right hon. J. H. A.
MacInnes, M.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
Mallock, R.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mills, hon. C. W.
More, R. J.
Morrison, W.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muntz, P. A.
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Pitt-Lewis, G.
Plowden, Sir W. C.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Powell, F. S.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Reid, H. B.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollitt, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
Salt, T.
Sandys, Lieut-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Selwyn, Capt. C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Smith, D.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Sutherland, T.
Swetenham, E.
Talbot, J. G.
Taplin, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Theobald, J.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, G. F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Verdin, R.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watkin, Sir E. W.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir. R. E.
Webster, R. G.
Weymouth, Viscount
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Wilson, Sir S.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Yerburgh, R. A.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SIXTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [19th August]—[See page 96.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words,—"And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said, that the Amendment was the solemn expression of the opinion of the Irish people.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. FLYNN, resuming, said, Boards of Guardians and other public bodies in every part of the country had passed resolutions denouncing evictions, and calling upon the Government to put a stop to them; and the question for the Government now was whether they would take the advice of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), or the advice of the Members who really represented Ireland? The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when speaking on the Address, referred in flippant tones to the agricultural distress in Ireland, and to the fall of prices in agricultural produce; and other speakers who followed him from the same side of the House treated the matter in very much the same spirit. But this depression was very real, and if, in consequence of it, farmers were unable to pay their rent and were evicted, the injury would not fall upon one class alone, but upon all classes of the community. The landlord himself would suffer, because no one in Ireland would take a farm from which a tenant had been evicted—the land would fall out of cultivation. In such a case not only would a large number of farms become vacant, and a large number of farmers ruined, but the demand for labour would be lessened, and the trade and commerce in the smaller towns, now stagnant, would become altogether destroyed. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, in his speech the previous evening, compared the landlords of Ireland to traders, and contended that the debt of the landlord was the same as the debt of any other trader; but in the eyes of the law, and evidently in the eyes of the House of Commons, a debt due to a landlord was a much more sacred thing than any other debt, because the ordinary creditor would not destrain and evict a tenant. They contended that in the present state of Ireland the shopkeepers and merchants in the towns and villages would be victimized to a large extent if the landlords persisted in this policy of eviction, because the ruin of the farming classes meant also the ruin of the traders. Great stress had been laid on the fact that judicial rents ought not to be altered; but the Members of the Party to which he (Mr. Flynn) belonged took great exception to the statements that had been made with regard to these judicial rents; and in endeavouring to controvert the statement that the payment of the present rents was in many cases an impossibility the Government and their supporters indulged in nothing but assertion and arguments of the most empty character. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told the House that there was no such fall in the price of Irish produce as would justify a reduction of rents. What proof did the Government want that there was a fall in the price of Irish produce? It was to be seen in every newspaper in the United Kingdom. Did the Government imagine that the Irish Members, many of them men of business, would come to the House and say that there was a fall in the price of Irish produce of from 40 to 50 per cent, without proof of the statement? Such statements as were put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer were made for the purpose of controversy only; but they certainly would not satisfy men of business who went into the question. The noble Lord had stated that the fall in the price of Irish butter was due to the quality, and to adulteration. If the noble Lord had known anything about Irish butter, he would have known that the fall in the price had been most marked lately, and that, although there were complaints about the quality some years ago, it had markedly improved within late years. The price of butter in the Cork Market regulated the price all over Ireland, and in Great Britain. He would show there had been a steady decline in the price of Irish butter with a steady advance in the quality of late years; and he asked the House to take the word of business men, speaking on matters with which they were familiar, rather than the *ipse dixit* of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The difference between the prices for Cork butter in 1881-2-3 and 1886 showed that there had been a falling-off in prices between the first and the last of these years up to last Saturday of 33 per cent. Second and third qualities of butter had fallen off in a greater proportion during the same period, nor had this depression been confined to butter. The falling-off in the prices of other products was almost as marked. It was for this reason that the Irish Members asked the House to stand between the Irish landlords and their tenants in the coming winter. He asserted that there was in Ireland no disinclination to pay a fair rent; but the people could not pay a rent which was impossible. It was for this reason that the Irish Members asked the Government to take some action in the matter before the winter season. It was for this purpose that the Amendment was framed; and they hoped that the Government would accept it, and not take an infatuated course in the interest of one particular class. In warning the Government of the consequences that were sure to follow a certain course of policy, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) spoke in a tone of emotion, which it was most unjust to describe as "cold-blooded." If the Government, with their eyes, open ignored the warnings of Irish Members, they would incur a serious responsibility. Should any system of organized eviction be entered upon, the Irish Members would stand by their people in every legal effort they might make in resistance. Their duty was clear both in the House and out of it.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen) said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had defended the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) from the attacks made on him by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket). That right hon. and learned Gentleman, however, did not attack the hon. Member for Cork because he prophesied that outrage and disorder would take place in Ireland during the coming winter, but because of the spirit in which those words were uttered. Nothing had been more instructive or astonishing in the course of the debate than the sympathy which had been shown in some quarters with those respectable gentlemen the "Moonlighters." ["No, no!"] The idea that they should meet with their deserts, and should suffer the penalty of death, which they had incurred, made the blood of hon. Members opposite run cold. They knew very well that it was the agitation which had taken place in Ireland during the last few years which had caused the disorder and outrages which had occurred. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) seemed to think there must be some legitimate grievance in Ireland, and that the government of England over Ireland had, to a certain extent, failed. But he (Viscount Cranborne) must remind the House that it had not been the fate of the Conservative Party to govern Ireland for many years in this century, and if there had been failure in the government of Ireland, the disorder which had resulted could not be laid at the door of the Conservative Party. It never entered the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite that no Government however good, that no policy however sound, could necessarily remove the discontent. A Government could insure that the law should be respected, and that all legitimate grievances should be removed; but it could not insure that all classes and ranks in a nation should be contented. That must depend upon the nation itself. The fact that discontent existed did not prove that the policy of the law was wrong. The murderer who was condemned to be hung was probably discontented; but that did not prove that the law under which he was going to suffer was wrong. And so in a civil suit. The party in a case against whom the verdict was given was probably discontented; but that did not prove that the verdict was wrong. Government could not insure that the people of Ireland should be contented. The best chance that that result would take place was that the Government should be respected, should be strong and firm in its policy. Depend upon it the sympathy of nine people out of ten was with the strong. The Conservative Party was far stronger than it had been for many years, and the people of England and Ireland would sympathize and support it. Hon. Members below the Gangway opposite had found great fault with the policy of the Government. It had been commonly said that the Government would not say anything at all about their policy, and hon. Members from Ireland had threatened a great deal of obstruction and protraction, because they thought the Government was going to say nothing about their policy; but the Government had said something about their policy, and yet he had found no difference in the loquacity of the Irish Members. But though Her Majesty's Government had announced their policy, which he believed was a sound policy, there had been a distinct attempt by Her Majesty's Opposition to force that policy, and the speeches of the Government that supported it, into a meaning which it could not be said to bear. The right hon. Gentleman who led the Opposition and his Friends and the hon. Member for the City of Cork appeared to know a great deal about the policy of the Government, and imagined there would be a vast expenditure of money, which they alleged the Government would take out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. On the Conservative side of the House they did not profess to know as much of the details of the policy of the Government as hon. Members opposite; but if it were true —which he imagined to be entirely contrary to the fact—that the Government were in the future going to place a large burden on the English taxpayer, it would say a great deal for the Government's disinterestedness. They were constantly taunted with holding on to Office, and at the same time with laying on large burdens. Both these charges could not be supported. He believed himself that the policy of the Government would benefit Ireland, and that the Commission would tend greatly to the advantage both of this country and of Ireland. The reasons for the non-payment of rent in Ireland were patent to all. In the first place, and in the main, it was due to the agitation over which the hon. Member for Cork presided. But, undoubtedly, there were other difficulties in certain parts of Ireland, as there must be in any country, which would render it difficult for some of the inhabitants to meet the obligations into which they had entered. The number of those individuals, however, was exceedingly limited, and their failure to meet their obligations was also limited. The hon. Member for Cork had said that the tenants in Ireland had trusted to this Parliament; and was this Parliament going to desert them? There was no question of desertion. It was not proposed that the rents should be in any way increased. If the Party opposite were to be believed, the Government were going to be so foolish as to pay half the rent of the tenants they were going to desert. It was not only the tenants that had trusted the Parliament; the landlords of Ireland had trusted the Government. ["Oh, oh!"] They foolishly believed that when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) passed his Bill in 1881 the small rents which were left to them would remain secure; but, in view of what had happened, what other course could the Government take but to inquire? Unfortunately, in recent years there had been too much insecurity to the landlords of Ireland. They were like the Pashas of a Turkish Province. No doubt, hon. Members opposite would say that, though the tenants had in no sense been deserted by Parliament and the Government, yet, in the coming winter, they would be at the tender mercies of their landlords, which would end in wholesale eviction. ["Hear, hear!"] He could not understand how hon. Members made that out. Though the unfortunate Irish landlords, knowing the insecurity of their tenure, had been, in some cases, tempted to exact the uttermost farthing from the tenants, as a class they had resisted the temptation. [*Laughter.*] He repeated what he had said, and rejoiced that they had so resisted; but, after all, the insecurity of the landlords was the danger of Ireland. Restore once more security to the landlords. Let them know that the word of a Parliament and of a Government was not to be set aside for any light Parliamentary advantage. Let them know that at least one Party in the State was prepared to defend and fulfil the obligations into which the Parliament of this country had entered, and nine-tenths of the real agrarian grievances in Ireland would be at an end. If he wanted any proof of the real advantages and benefits of the policy announced by Her Majesty's Government it was the attitude of the hon. Member for Cork. ["Hear, hear!"] The irritation of the hon. Member was openly manifested. No doubt, the hon. Member was afraid when he saw a strong Government in power. [*Laughter.*] He did not mean merely strong in numbers, but strong in policy. He was well aware that if the Government succeeded in removing the last vestiges of real grievances in Ireland, they would have gone a long way to destroy the power of the hon. Member and deprive him of the support he received from the other side of the Atlantic. By this Amendment the House was asked to vote, practically, that evictions should be stopped in Ireland. Could there be anything more unreasonable than that, because a few tenants in one small part of Ireland were unable to meet their obligations, the landlords all over Ireland should be deprived of the rent to which they might have a claim? For, of course, if this Parliament were to enact that evictions should cease in Ireland, it would for the time being put a stop altogether to the payment of rent in that country. That being the case, he did not think there could be any doubt in the minds of hon. Members, whether on his own side of the House or on the Benches opposite, provided they were not absolutely bewildered by partizan spirit and by irritation at the result of the late General Election, that his noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Her Majesty's Government should be supported in the division which he hoped would be taken that evening.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) said, that the distress in both England and Ireland was due to the fact that the people in both countries were divorced from the soil which they tilled. The people of Ireland protested, with all their might, against being made mere surface-holders. The Members of that House daily prayed that the earth might bring forth fruits, but for whom? Not for the tiller, but for the landlord. But the law was not always consonant with natural or Divine law. While the New Testament had said the tiller should be the first, British law said he should be the last, to share the fruits of the soil, with the result that the people were reduced to a state of comparative servitude. Everyone who was too lazy to work was, in fact, placed on the shoulders of the tiller of the soil. One of the reasons why the landlords were maintained by England in Ireland was because they were supposed to be a peculiarly loyal class; but that was not true. It was not true from 1641-5, nor in 1688-9, when it might be truly said that every time that British Sovereigns were driven from the Throne those men were found in the ranks of their enemies. Since 1841 4,000,000 of the people of Ireland had been done to death by the landlords of Ireland. The world was said to be the reflex of a man's own conduct. So, as it was with individuals, it had been with nations. If nations wanted the loyalty of the people subject to them, there was a way in human affairs by which men's hearts could be captivated. But what had the Parliament done to attract the loyalty of the people of Ireland, and what had they refused to do for the landlords? There were now 50,000 British troops in that country, lent to the landlords to maintain the British law, contrary to the natural and the Divine law. There must be some consistency in the policy of the country. They could not vote £20,000,000 to rescue the negroes of the West Indies from slavery, and, at the same time, render the people of England and Ireland slaves. It was because the people of Ireland urged that the soil of the country should belong to them that English Governments were face to face so frequently with the Irish difficulty. Owing to the severity of foreign competition, the tenants of Ireland, as well as those of England and Scotland, were unable to pay the rents exacted by the landlords. In his opinion, the real cause of agricultural depression was the holding of large tracts of territory by men who rendered no services to the State in return. They did not labour, but merely received money which others had earned, investing it securely and profitably in stocks. It was said that Britons never would be slaves; but millions of the people of England were divorced from the soil, and with what result? There were the workmen of the City of London, who starved last winter, and whom he had seen scrambling for bread; while the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted millions to be voted for the war in Burmah. Inquests were held in numbers last winter on men who were done to death in England through being divorced from the soil of their own country. They came to London to compete in a market already overstocked with labour, and the consequence was that they starved. In fighting the battle of Irishmen they were, in fact, fighting the battle for Englishmen. If that House did not remedy the present state of affairs, Englishmen, far faster than Irishmen, would remedy it for them. In these days, when steamers of 6,000 or 8,000 tons were constantly making the most rapid passages across the Atlantic Ocean, it was simply impossible that the cultivators of the soil in countries where rent was paid could compete with countries where no rent was paid. Talk of the depression of trade! The simple fact was that the agriculturists of England and Ireland were done to death by the American competition, carried on in these large and rapid steamers, each of which carried a cargo equal to the produce of half a county. What was the cause of the depression of trade? It was the giving large tracts of land to people who returned nothing to the State, either in the payment of taxes or in the labour, which was the only source of wealth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is not speaking to the specific Amendment before the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLANE said, that he dealt with social order in Ireland, and that was connected with the Land Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must insist upon the hon. Member adhering to the terms of the Amendment—that of the hon. Member for Cork, to which I would call his attention.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLANE, after recapitulating his argument with regard to the effect of American competition upon the English and Irish cultivators, said, that he thought it not too much to ask an Assembly like that to say that the tiller of the soil should, according to the New Testament, be the partaker of the fruits thereof. But the present system was sweeping away the breadstuffs from before the eyes of the man who produced them in order to support landlords. In conclusion, he most energetically complained that the landlords of Ireland were the administrators of the law and the judges in their own cause, a state of things which, he contended, was most unfair, and contrary to all the principles of justice. He appealed to the Radicals in the House, whose cause the Irish Members were fighting as well as the cause of the poor, oppressed people of Ireland, to vote for the Amendment now before the House.

Colonel WARING (Down, N.) said, he had no intention to prolong the debate; but he wished to correct a slight misunderstanding that appeared to exist with regard to the remarks of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Armagh (Major Saunderson) on the previous day, as to the propriety of the English people putting their hands into their pockets for the benefit of Ireland. His hon. and gallant Friend had not expressed a desire that English money should be forthcoming in aid of Irish landlords, but had simply asked that England should aid in the development of Irish industries, as a compensation for the injury done in past times by the crushing of the industries of Ireland. He (Colonel Waring) held quite as strongly as hon. Gentlemen opposite the view that, in that respect, England owed a debt to Ireland, and ought not to forget that certain industries in Ireland were extinguished by English jealousy. Those were industries which were instituted by the ancestors of the present English Colony, those who were afraid that they would be dealt with in a very summary manner by an Irish Parliament. ["No, no!"] He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen opposite were responsible for the utterances of Mr. Davitt. Mr. Davitt certainly said so.

Mr. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) rose to Order, and said Mr. Davitt had emphatically repudiated the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of Order arises on that.

Colonel WARING, resuming, said, if Mr. Davitt had repudiated it, it was his misfortune not to have seen the repudiation; but, unfortunately, repudiations were pretty common. However, there was no doubt as to the establishment of these industries in the South and West by men of the same blood as those in the North, who were spoken of as the English Colony; and if they had been permitted to exist and thrive, and had not been extinguished, it was quite possible that, at the present time, from the South and West of Ireland Representatives might be sitting on his side of the House. They now simply asked Parliament to give to Ireland what was her due. Turning to the Amendment, much was said about the cruelty of evictions by the landlord; and he would admit that in the poorest parts of Ireland, where chronic poverty prevailed, the people might be unable to pay the judicial rents; but it was a different case with reference to the rest of Ireland. The hard times were undoubtedly felt by the tenants; but so they were by all other classes. It was hard that the landlord in these times should be forced to retrench, while the tenant showed no disposition to economize; and he feared that whilst the landlords had done their best to economize and retrench their expenses, many of the tenants had been going on living in the same way as they did in the good times.

He knew an instance which occurred recently. A landlord was driving into a country town with his wife, and he saw a very smart young lady whose dress his wife very much admired. The young lady proved to be one of the three daughters of a tenant of his who owed three years' rent. On that young lady's back was the equivalent of at least a quarter of a year's rent, and that quarter multiplied by her two sisters and her mother as well would have made up precisely a year's rent. The result was that the landlord had to go without his rent, whilst these young ladies got their dresses from Mantalini's, or elsewhere. That kind of thing proved that if care was exercised the tenant would be enabled to pay his debts. He admitted that eviction was a terrible thing, and, personally, he had never put it in force; but whether it might not be right to do so, under certain eventualities, he would not undertake to say. It was very difficult to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the tenant could or could not pay, and eviction was often the final test. There was, however, hardly a landlord in Ireland who would evict a tenant whose inability to pay arose from real misfortune. But the fact was that until eviction proceedings were begun, it was impossible in many cases to know whether the tenant could really pay or not. It was wonderful what hidden resources were disclosed at the appearance of the Sheriff's officer. He was sure that the great bulk of the landlords would accept what the tenant could pay in good faith, and would not press for the remainder. The House might remember, however, that there were evictions of various kinds. A landlord might find himself under notice of ejectment if he did not meet his engagements, and who was to protect him? What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander; and if evictions were to be prohibited on behalf of the tenant, they should be prohibited with reference to the landlord and his creditors. He would be bound to say that there were more evictions in London in a month than there were in all Ireland in the course of the year, and nothing was said about them. He could speak on the question with some freedom, as he had the honour of having been spoken of by an hon. Member from the Benches opposite as a model landlord. He did not see that it signified much whether a man was turned out on the roadside of Kerry or on the pavement of Whitechapel. He heard of no proposition to suspend evictions in England, and he might suggest to English Liberal Members that they might take that point into consideration before they began to be so very liberal with other people's property in Ireland. He observed that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) had now entered the House, and therefore he would at once conclude his remarks, so that he might not stand between the House and the right hon. Gentleman, whose speech the House was awaiting with interest.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.) rose, with MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.), to continue the debate.

MR. SPEAKER called upon Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I wish, Sir, to make an appeal to you upon a point of Order. I wish to know whether it is not the recognized practice that the debate should be resumed by the hon. Member who moved the adjournment on the previous day? If the hon. Member who had so moved the adjournment failed to be in his place at the resumption of the debate, is he entitled, at a subsequent period, to precedence over other hon. Members who have been here all the evening, and desire to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) had been in his place at the commencement of the debate, he would have claimed his right to address the House; but I see nothing to debar him from rising to address the House at a later period. I have called upon the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: I am very sorry, indeed, if, on the present occasion, I stand between the House and any other hon. Gentlemen who think that they have a better right to address it. I understood, however, that there were some of my hon. Friends—I understood it from their earlier statements in the course of this debate—and that there were many other hon. Members who thought that they were entitled to require of me a statement of my views on the policy which has been proposed to us by the Government, and I certainly thought that

I should probably consult their convenience best if I did not rise during the dinner hour, but took the earliest opportunity after that time, in order to make the few remarks I desire to make. I think that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell)—I do not know whether intentionally or not—has placed those who follow him in a position of considerable embarrassment. He has proposed an Amendment which I venture to say is incomplete and inconclusive. He has introduced it in a speech which was very powerful, very full, very frank, and very complete. But, Sir, by the Rules of the House, inasmuch as that speech travelled very widely beyond the terms of the Amendment, we are unable to deal with many important portions of it, and we are confined absolutely to matters which are relevant to the terms of the Amendment. Sir, the Amendment consists of two parts, to neither of which, treated solely as abstract propositions, have I myself any great objection. The first part of the Amendment expresses, in somewhat hesitating language, an apprehension that there may be considerable difficulty experienced during the coming autumn and winter in the payment of rent, that it may lead to evictions, and that evictions may endanger public order. Well, Sir, the only remark I have to make upon that is that I think, having regard to what we have been told in the course of this debate as to the enormous prices that are still being paid for the tenant right of those properties, that the terms of the Amendment are a little too general. I do not think it can be asserted that the tenants of Ireland, speaking of them as a class, are unable to pay their rents in consequence of the fall in prices. But it may well be—and I should not myself see the slightest objection to expressing an apprehension that it may be—that a portion—a minority, at all events—of these tenants may be placed in a position of considerable difficulty. But what I object to is, that it is unnecessary and superfluous to make statements of that kind in answer to the Speech from the Throne, and I say that because I think it will be agreed that it is not the practice of the House to make affirmations of that kind, unless we are prepared, at the same time, to recommend some remedy for the state of things which we fear. The case of the Irish tenants is not the only case in regard to which similar apprehensions might be expressed. There are many cases that suggest themselves to hon. Members. I will only mention one. We might address Her Majesty and say that during the coming autumn and winter, the depression of trade which has continued so long will lead to increased lack of employment, and that that want of employment, in turn, may be productive of great suffering, and may endanger social order. That may be perfectly true. My only objection to put an addition of that kind to the Address to the Throne would be that it would be useless and improper to do so, unless, at the same time, the House was prepared to deal with the subject-matter, and to find a complete and satisfactory remedy. The second part of the Amendment of the hon. Member is in the nature of what I may call an anticipatory repudiation of a policy which finds no expression whatever in the Queen's Speech, and the existence of which I understand is denied absolutely by the Members of Her Majesty's Government in this House. We know perfectly well what is the meaning of the last paragraph of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Cork. It has reference, no doubt, to a paragraph in a speech which is reported to have been spoken in "another place" by the Head of the Government. Well, Sir, according to the Rules of this House, we are not entitled to discuss matters which pass in "another place;" and I admit for the very good reason that the speakers are not here to answer for themselves, and to give the necessary explanations and corrections of their reported utterances. All I can say in addition, at the present moment, in reference to this last paragraph is, that I also deprecate any attempt to transfer the losses which may fall on the landlords owing to the circumstances of the season and other causes to the pockets of the British taxpayers. I have deprecated it before, and I deprecate it again. I do not believe that the Government would be so foolish as to make any proposition of the kind. If ever they do, all I can say is that by whatsoever Government, or under whatsoever circumstances it may be made, I shall be bound by everything that I have said in the past, and by the opinions I hold at present, to offer it the most strenuous opposition in my power. But, Sir, that is one thing. As an abstract proposition it may be all very well; but, on the other hand, I beg to say that I am not going to vote for an Amendment, the carrying of which would be equivalent to a Vote of Censure on the Government. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] I quite understand that cheer. I do not wish that there should be, in the slightest degree, any mistake; I am not going to do anything to turn out this Government, as long as the Government which is to take its place is committed to a Separatist policy, which I believe would be injurious to the best interests of Ireland and of Great Britain. And, certainly, I am not going to do that on an Amendment of this kind, which is not only vague and inconclusive, but, in my opinion, is disingenuous, and which I believe may properly be described as an unnecessary affirmative and a gratuitous negative. Now, Sir, one thing that I want to know is, are my Friends who belong to the Liberal Party, who are described as Separatist Liberals, going to vote for this Amendment? [*Cries of* "Yes!"] Well, I observe that my right hon. Friend the late Prime Minister, who, unfortunately, is no longer with us, declared before he left the country that if he had remained he would not have voted for it. I beg my hon. Friends with whom I disagree on this one point of Irish policy to consider very carefully what they are doing. They are going, I hear some of them say, to vote for the Amendment. By so doing, they will give, no doubt, a hypothetical condemnation of a policy which, with more or less authority, is attributed to Lord Salisbury. That I dare say they will not object to; but, Sir, they are going to give an emphatic, and definite, and unequivocal condemnation of the policy of their own Leader, and of the late Government. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] They say "No!" but they cannot get out of it. I beg to call their attention to the words of the Amendment. The words of the Amendment are these—

> "And we deprecate any extension of State-aided purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."

What was the Land Bill of the late Government? The Land Purchase Bill of the late Government contemplated an extension of the system of State-aided purchase. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] There are some Gentlemen apparently who will contradict anything. I am quite sure that none of my right hon. Friends, who speak with any sense of responsibility, will deny that the Land Purchase Bill of the late Government was a Bill for the extension of State-assisted purchase—that is to say, that the price of purchase was fixed on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they are now. Therefore, I say that hon. Members behind me who vote for this Amendment are giving a Vote of Censure on the late Government very much more emphatic. [*Home Rule cries of* "No, no!"] Well, Sir, there are none so blind as those who will not see. In my opinion, they will be giving a Vote of Censure much more emphatic and decided than upon anything that can properly be attributed to the present Government. Well, Sir, I should like now, if the House will allow me, to consider for a few moments what is the present position of the Liberal Party with regard to this great question of Land Purchase. What is the position of the Leaders of the Liberal Party with regard to the question? Has my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) abandoned the policy of the Land Bill which he introduced into the last Parliament? He was challenged to answer that question again and again in the course of the last Election, but he never answered it. He has made two speeches in this House during the present Session, but he has not said anything upon that subject. I know that there are Liberal Members below the Gangway who have insinuated that my right hon. Friend is prepared to abandon this policy in the future, because he has found that it hampered him in the promotion of the Bill for the Government of Ireland, and that, in the future, we shall hear no more of it. Have my hon. Friends forgotten that my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian declared his Bill for Land Purchase to be an obligation of honour? What could be more insulting to my right hon. Friend than to suggest, as some of his followers have dared to suggest, that for Party purposes he would abandon an obligation of honour? But if my right hon. Friend—even if it were to be supposed, which I cannot suppose—were to change his opinion on the subject, what is the position of Lord Spencer?—what is the position of my right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley)? They have made no secret of it whatever. They were bold, honest, and consistent throughout the Elections in this matter. Lord Spencer said, again and again, that it would be unfair to the landlords of Ireland to hand them over entirely to the popular Party, or to the decision of the popular Party, and that they ought to be protected by some such scheme as that proposed by the late Government. My right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland has said, again and again, that the settlement of the Land Question was, to his mind, a necessary preliminary to, or, at all events, that it must accompany, any provision for the better government of Ireland by Home Rule. My right hon. Friend, in one of his latest speeches, said he would never be a party to handing over to a new authority in Dublin the settlement of the Land Question; that he held it to be an evil legacy which we were not entitled to leave to them; that in the interests of the tenants, as well as in the interests of the landlords, it was the duty of England to deal with the matter in the interests of the tenants themselves before creating a separate Parliament in Dublin. Very well, Sir, I am speaking in the presence of my right hon. Friend, and I am sure that he will say that I am not misrepresenting him. How is it possible, in the face of circumstances of that kind, that he could accept the abandonment of the policy of the Land Purchase Bill? Without speaking of details, I maintain that the fact that he is pledged to a great system of State-aided purchase of the land as a necessary preliminary accompaniment of any measure of Home Rule is as clear as the day, and it is dishonouring to my right hon. Friend the late Prime Minister and his Colleagues to suggest that they would be false to everything that they have stated on this subject in the course of the Election. But then I should like to know, if this is the position of the Leaders, what is the position of those whom I am obliged to allude to—I know they do not accept the term, but I do not use it offensively—but whom I am obliged, for the purposes of distinction, to call the Separatist Liberals? ["Oh, oh!"] Well, what is their position? As far as it has been expressed in the course of the debate theirs is a position of uncompromising hostility to any scheme of Land Purchase. ["No, no!"] Oh, yes, as far as it can be gathered from the course of this debate. Let the Gentlemen behind me who are in favour of the Land Purchase scheme of the late Government get up in their places and say so. There are precious few of them who will dare to say so to their constituents. In this House Member after Member got up and said he was opposed to it, although he was in favour of the Home Rule Bill. During the Elections, of course, every Member was opposed to it, and hoped that he would hear of it no more, and said that the landlords had had their last offer, and so on. But I want to point out to these Gentlemen that their position is a very perilous one. They are in a very "parlous state." They are Dissentient Liberals. I beg them—I beg my hon. Friends to take warning by me. I am to be expelled from the Liberal Party. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] It is not the Irish Members who will be able to do it. I am to be ostracized, because I, unfortunately, was unable to support the two Bills that were brought in by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian; and here we have Gentlemen who oppose one of them. Well, is it to be held that it is a capital crime to oppose two Bills, and that it is only a venial eccentricity to oppose one? No, Sir, unless my hon. Friends are prepared to swallow the Land Bill they must go out of the Party too, and a very small Party will remain. If my hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), the new Leader of the Party, upon whom Elijah's mantle is to fall, but who, I think, will be found a little too small for that extensive garment—if he is to have his way the Liberal Party will become "small by degrees and beautifully less."

MR. YEO (Glamorganshire, W.): I rise to Order, Sir. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Order!"] I wish to point out that the right hon. Gentleman is not speaking to the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER took no notice of the interruption.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN again rose, amid loud cries of "Order!"

and "Chair!" from the Home Rule Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I call upon Mr. Chamberlain.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (resuming): I say, Sir, that one by one, in squads and sections, the Liberal Party will disappear, and at last it will be reduced to the condition of a sect of which I remember to have heard in my youth, and which also bore the ominous name of "Separatist." It consisted of only two persons—a man and his wife, and the wife was heard to say at times that she had grave doubts whether her husband would be saved. And now, Sir, I turn to the Unionist Liberals. What is their opinion with regard to this question of Land Purchase? My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) has expressed his views on the subject. Everyone will recognize that he said nothing that would commit him to oppose an extensive system of State-aided Land Purchase. It is supposed by hon. Gentlemen who are good enough to quote me, although, not accurately, and who refer to my opinions in the past, apparently without ever taking the trouble to read what I have said—it is asserted by them that I at least am committed, by what I said at the Elections, to absolute opposition to all State-aided purchase of land. That is exactly the reverse of the fact. On the contrary, I am committed by everything I have said to support, cordially and heartily, a large system of Land Purchase. [*Cries of* "No!"] Refer to *Hansard*. See what I said on the second reading of the Land Bill. I said then that I was in favour of a large scheme of Land Purchase. Why, it is made an accusation against me by some of my hon. Friends, who appear to know Cabinet secrets without being in the Cabinet, and who have made it an accusation against me, that I brought forward a large scheme of Land Purchase which was a scheme almost as extensive in principle as the scheme of my right hon. Friend, but more dangerous, and with less security to the British taxpayer than that of my right hon. Friend. However, that is a point I will not argue now; but I will argue it at the proper time. I only point to it now, in order to show that, by the confession of everyone who knows best, I have always, in private and public, been in favour of a great scheme of Land Purchase. Why did I object to the scheme of my right hon. Friend? I have always held that at the bottom of this Irish Question is the Land Question. You cannot deal satisfactorily with the Irish problem unless you can settle the agrarian problem first. I believe no settlement can be found in the system of dual ownership. It is only by the creation of a great scheme of peasant proprietorship, and doing what Germany, Russia, Bavaria, and other countries have done, that you can settle the Irish Question. You cannot create a peasant proprietorship in Ireland, except by one of two ways—either by a vast confiscation of the property of private individuals, which, as far as I know, is not advocated by any single Member of the House of Commons, or by a great scheme of State-aided purchase. That is the only practical alternative; I have never denied it, and of that I have always been in favour. But I was opposed to the scheme of my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, because it involved a risk so tremendous that it amounted to a certainty of loss. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!"] My right hon. Friends around me are coming over to my opinion very quickly. ["No, no!"] Ah! but I will show you. When I argued this question in the last Parliament, I pointed to the statement which had been made that there had been a great fall in the price of produce. I said that if that fall in the price of produce were established, the Irish tenants would say that they were unable to pay the rents which were the basis of the scheme. If they paid less than the rents upon which the scheme was prepared, there would be a deficiency in the security, and the taxpayers would have to make it good. At that time my right hon. Friends vouchsafed no answer whatever to that representation. Now, it appears, they are equally convinced with myself that there is great danger that the fall in the price of produce, which undoubtedly has taken place, will have its effect upon Irish rents. Well, my right hon. Friend the late Prime Minister in his speech the other night referred, I think for the first time—I do not remember that he referred to it during the debates in the last Parliament—to an additional security which he said made his scheme absolutely safe, and that was that it was backed up by the whole of the Revenue of Ireland, which was pledged for this purpose. My right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland says the land revenue—[Mr. JOHN MORLEY here interposed a remark.] Yes; that, of course, was the result. That is my contention—namely, that it was backed by the land revenue, and by nothing else. Let me examine this. My right hon. Friend says it was backed by the whole Revenue of Ireland. The only portion of the Revenue of Ireland over which this House could have had any control under my right hon. Friend's scheme was the Customs and Excise. Over them we have an absolute control, according to his scheme, and they were pledged in security for Irish rents., [An hon. MEMBER: A portion.] Yes; but there was a first mortgage upon them. My right hon. Friend and my hon. Friends behind me seem to have forgotten that. And what was that first mortgage? It was, in the first place, the whole of the share of Ireland of the National Debt; in the second place, the whole of the fixed share of Ireland towards the payment of the Army and the Navy; and also, in the third place, £1,000,000 a-year towards the cost of the Constabulary; and when all those are paid, and when the first mortgage is cleared off, what remains? Only a few hundrds of thousands. [Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER: Millions.] Nonsense! I beg my right hon. Friend's pardon; but the expression escaped me in the heat of the moment. My right hon. Friend is a great authority on this subject; but, with all deference to him, I beg to say that I cannot accept his statement. My conviction is this—that the balance of the Customs and Excise, after payment of all these things, which are the first mortgage upon it, amounted only to a few hundreds of thousands of pounds—and that is a balance which is perfectly useless for our purposes—perfectly useless as a security. The slightest variation in the collection of the Revenue, the slightest variation in the consumption of whisky, or in the payment of the duty in the locality in which the payment takes place, would destroy absolutely that security itself. I agree with the late Chief Secretary for Ireland that the land revenue was the security. Yes; but the land revenue was made up by those rents which my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) now tells us cannot be paid in the case of five-sixths of the tenants of Ireland. When did my right hon. Friend first come to that opinion? He and his Colleagues are in this dilemma—if they knew it at the time they introduced the Land Bill, why did they not tell us? Why did they not give us some intimation that the security they proposed was open to this great deduction? They could not have known it at that time. It is impossible that they could. They could not have withheld their information from the House of Commons if they had known it; and, therefore, it comes to this, that we have to place what confidence we may on the information which has only been obtained since they left Office—which is only at their disposal since they lost all access to official information. Well, Sir, but I took another objection to the Land Bill of my right hon. Friend. I said I would not be a party to lending any British money at all to what was going to be practically a foreign country. Now, that is the point to which I want to call the attention of the House and of my hon. Friends. It is one thing that the whole resources of the Empire should be devoted to adding to the happiness and prosperity of those for whom the Imperial Parliament is directly responsible, and another thing altogether to lend money to a foreign country. I will take the case of Canada. I ask whether the House would lend £150,000,000, or £15,000,000, or £1,500,000, in order to buy out the Canadian landlords? The thing has only to be stated in order that you may see the absurdity of it. But I do not want hon. Members to think because I am opposed to lending money to a self-governing Colony, or to Ireland, if it is placed in the position of a self governing Colony, that therefore I am opposed to lending money to Ireland if it remains an integral portion of the United Kingdom. Why, Sir, what was the general controversy to which I devoted myself? I am afraid now it will appear with very little advantage in the course of the autumn. What was that controversy which was described by our opponents as concerning three acres and a cow? Why, it was a large and a just proposal that municipalities throughout the United Kingdom should be empowered compulsorily to obtain land for the purpose of creating allotments and small holdings, with the view of aiding in the creation of a peasant proprietary, and that they should be backed in this work by the credit of the State. What I would do for England and Scotland, of course I would do for Ireland, so long as she remains an integral portion of the Empire. Under these circumstances, what I have to say in conclusion on this branch of the subject is, that I wait for the definite proposals of the Government, but that I am prepared to give a favourable consideration—I would say further, a cordial support—to any proposal they may make for the establishment of a peasant proprietary in Ireland, provided that the whole arrangement is under the complete and effective control of the Imperial Parliament, and provided that it is secured by the intervention of municipal authority. Well, Sir, the Government do not propose to confine their inquiry entirely to the question of Land Purchase. They propose to inquire into judicial rents. They propose to inquire into the subject of public works; and they propose themselves to act as a Commission during the autumn and winter for the purpose of inquiry into the subject of local government. Well, I do not think that some of my right hon. Friends are justified in the ridicule which they have cast upon these proposals. The late Government came into Office as a Government of Inquiry. Does it lie in our mouth to complain that the present Government is also a Government of Inquiry? My right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) referred very wittily to these projects of Commissions, and reminded us of the ancedote about the red lion. But my right hon. Friend has been a great artist in red lions himself. He has proposed to the House more than one Commission, and I do seriously say——

Mr. YEO (Glamorganshire, W.): I rise to Order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the right hon. Gentleman is speaking to the Amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the right hon. Gentleman is proposing to allude to other Commissions about to be issued by the Government, I think that would be travelling out of the particular terms of the specific Amendment now before the House.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: On the point of Order the course of my argument is this. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) proposes to declare the existence of certain grievances and his apprehension of certain evils. He does not himself propose in his Amendment any remedy for those evils; and I imagine that I am in Order in considering the remedies which he did propose in his speech, or any other remedies which may meet the grievances to which he refers. ["No!" *and* "Chair!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the practice in our Parliamentary procedure, that when an hon. Member moves an Amendment to the Address, before he reaches that Amendment he may deviate into other matters, To a certain extent he thus places himself in an advantageous position; but when he has moved a specific Amendment, according to the Rules of the House, that specific Amendment becomes the substantive matter before the House.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Speaker, I was well aware that the position was, to some extent, an embarrassing one, especially if the House is not willing to extend to me the indulgence which was asked for and granted to my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). Sir, I will endeavour to pass over any point which you may consider to be outside the scope of the Amendment. I had intended to refer to the Commissions, and to see how far the work of these Commissions was likely to affect a state of things which is described in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. But if you think that in doing that I shall be out of Order, of course I shall be bound to obey your ruling. I was saying—I will not refer to the personal question—I was saying this, and I really think it is a general observation to which no exception can be taken, that I do not think it is desirable, on either side of the House, that we should ridicule the idea of proceeding by inquiry. It seems to me that in all these very important matters Royal Commissions are of the greatest service to the Governments of either Party. The only exception that can be made, and the only objection that can be fairly taken to a Royal Commission, is when it is appointed for the purpose of shelving some question——

Mr. W. MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossary Division): Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. I want to know, with all respect, whether the right hon. Gentleman is in Order in alluding to these Commissions, and to the whole policy of the Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman would be in order in discussing the whole policy of the Government; and it will be in the recollection of the House that I have already restrained other Members from doing so. That liberty which, in the exercise of my duty, I have denied to other hon. Members, of course, as far as I am concerned, I cannot extend to the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: Then, Sir, I think I shall put it to the House whether they will be good enough to extend to me the indulgence which they have already extended to other right hon. Gentlemen? I will promise, if they will, that I will deal very briefly with this part of the subject, and I only want to allude to it to make my argument clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must distinctly repeat that the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman must be confined to the specific Amendment before the House.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): On the question of Order, Sir, may I respectfully submit to you that if the right hon. Gentleman, by his argument, proposes to show the danger or loss to the British taxpayer, he is not entitled to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is not one to be argued after what I have already stated.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: In deference to your ruling, Sir, I will not refer to that part of the policy of the Government which is contained in the proposal to appoint the Royal Commission. I will turn to the argument of the hon. Member for Cork. What is the remedy which he proposes for the state of things which he describes in his Amendment? He has told us candidly that, in his opinion, the only remedy—the only satisfactory and complete remedy—is the establishment of an Irish Parliament in Dublin. But the hon. Member seems to forget that, even if this view were accepted, it would not in the slightest degree meet the crisis which he anticipates in November. We have to deal in the Amendment with a crisis which is declared to be imminent, with a general inability to pay rent, with numerous evictions, with consequent suffering, and with great danger to social order. How would that be met by an assertion, supposing such an assertion could be obtained from Parliament, of its intention to establish, at some future time, an Irish Parliament in Dublin? Sir, upon that point the hon. Member made a very remarkable statement. He said, in effect, that the Irish people would have accepted the Land Bill of the late Government, although they objected to the extravagance of its proposals, and that they would have paid to the uttermost farthing, so that the British taxpayers would have lost nothing, if it had been accompanied by Home Rule. Then, Sir, what becomes of the inability of the Irish people to pay taxes?

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): He never said anything of the kind.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: What becomes, I say, of the inability of the Irish tenant, under these circumstances, to pay taxes? The hon. Member well knows that it is impossible to obtain from this Parliament any assertion of the kind. He expressed himself very well satisfied with the Election, and he looks forward with confidence to another appeal to the country. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] Well, Sir, that is not a very hearty cheer; but if hon. Members are satisfied, so am I. I remember the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), and many others in the last Parliament, thinking and saying that the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian would sweep the country. I ventured to warn them that they were counting without their host, and I told them, from my own knowledge, that the result would be very different from what they anticipated, and that the Unionist majority in this House would be increased. It has been increased—it has been quadrupled. I only wish to warn them once more that, if they appeal again on this subject, they may take my word for it that the result will be the same; and if they persist in going to destruction on their own account, it will be worse for them than the last Election. Well, Sir, the hon. Member for Cork nade a more practical suggestion than hat we should establish a Home Rule Parliament. He made this suggestion, s I understood him, that judicial rents hould be revised periodically according o a sliding scale. I thought for myself hat it was a very taking suggestion. I lo not know how far it may be practi-able; but I may say that I have re-eived many letters from Ireland from ersons who are well qualified to speak n such a subject—[*Cries of* "Name!"] —from land agents, from landlords —[*Laughter from the Home Rule Members*] —yes; and from tenants, who seem to hink that in the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cork there may really be ound a solution of the present difficulty vith regard to judicial rents. Well, Sir, know that it is very difficult for an English Member to judge these Irish uestions, and I have never attempted o dogmatize about them. ["Oh!"] I nust say that hon. Members below the angway are a little unreasonable. They nterrupt me when I disagree with the on. Member for Cork. They now in-errupt me because I am agreeing with im. In reference to this question of rish opinion, I acknowledge that I hould like to refer to a statement which articularly concerns myself, and which vas made by the hon. Member for Cork. he hon. Member said, and said truly, hat I had intended to visit Ireland and ee for myself, as far as I could, the ondition of the country, and consult ocal opinion; and he had the good taste o say that I was deterred from that isit because Mr. Healy threatened to luck me in a horse-pond. I do not be-ieve that statement; I do not believe hat Mr. Healy ever made use of any uch coarse and vulgar threat. At all vents, I am not aware of it. It is true hat I did receive threats at that time— hreats from people who told me that I hould be murdered if I went to Ire-and; but I did not pay much attention o them. I thought they were merely vidences of ill-restrained enthusiasm, ery much of the same kind as that of he hon. Member from Ireland who poke yesterday, and who admitted that e had, in the course of a speech, spoken of shooting landlords like partridges, but who explained that this was not to be taken seriously, because he objected to shooting even partridges. But, Sir, I did not go to Ireland for a different reason. I did not carry out my intention to proceed there because the persons who had promised me introductions to leading members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the representatives of the National opinion withdrew their promises. I found that if I went to Ireland I should be "Boycotted"—that I should be obliged to consult one side only, and that I should be unable to make the impartial inquiry which I had contemplated. I only refer to this in order to point out the inconsistency of hon. Members. Again and again, since I have been in this House, I have heard them taunt English Members and English Ministers with taking no pains to visit Ireland and make themselves acquainted with the condition of that country, and with not visiting Ireland, although they were in the habit of visiting the Continent. And then, when two Ministers proposed to devote their holiday—the first opportunity they had—to the consideration, on the spot, of these questions, hon. Members who profess to represent the majority of the people of Ireland do everything in their power to render their visit impossible and useless. But there is another point in connection with that. Hon. Members on this side of the House have referred in the course of this controversy again and again to a speech which I delivered, and in which I spoke in very strong language of the system known as Dublin Castle, and compared it with the bureaucratic system of Austria and Russia. But they quoted that as if I were in favour of a Statutory Parliament. [*Cries of* "Question!"] I am referring to a personal allusion that was made by the hon. Member for Cork. I say that my visit to Ireland was planned immediately after that speech, and the opposition of the hon. Members from Ireland to that visit shows that they did not, at that time, accept me as a convert to their views. Now, I want the House to consider what are the facts with regard to this question of judicial rents. I want hon. Members to look at it from both sides. In the first place, it appears to me that there are two strong arguments in favour of those who hold that the judicial rents should be maintained. There is, in the first place, the fact that when the Land Act of 1881 was passed it undoubtedly took from the landlords a legal estate and transferred it to the tenants, and that it was held out to the landlords that this sacrifice on their part would be a final sacrifice, and that the measure was one which would be absolutely adequate for the purpose of giving peace to Ireland. That was the contention of the author of the Land Act. Well, I confess it is a rather hard doctrine that the same men should be told within two or three years after the passing of the Act that it is altogether insufficient, and that the whole question must be re-opened. Then there is another point also in their favour, and that is that we are not certain, in this matter of rent, that inability to pay is the only factor in the case. We want to know whether there is a willingness to pay; and we want to know when there is a willingness to pay, whether there is any interference with that willingness to pay from any outside authority. Well, Sir, we know perfectly well—I do not believe that there is anyone who is acquainted even superficially with the state of affairs in Ireland who does not know, on good authority—of cases in which tenants have brought their rents secretly to their landlords because they were honest men, and because they were afraid lest the National League should know that they were honest, and should punish them for it. And now we want to know, in considering this question of judicial rents, are the tenants to be free to pay, if they are willing to pay, or are they to be coerced by outside agencies? The hon. Member for Cork has shown that he can exercise great influence. He has exercised it; he has undoubtedly exercised it during the last 12 months, and I believe it is owing to his means that crime has greatly decreased. Does he intend to exercise that influence in the same direction, or does he intend to provoke the people? [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Withdraw!"] I am asking a question. [*Renewed cries of* "Withdraw!"] I certainly shall not withdraw the question, but I shall wait with great interest for an answer. We are told to look at the Chicago Convention, and we have been told in this very debate that there is a proof of the great moderation of the Irish people. Well, Sir, I should be very glad to see the signs of moderation in that Assembly. I admit that it is of great importance, for I know that where the funds are there the policy is. I have read every word of the report of the proceedings at that Convention, and what do I find? I find that one of the delegates of the Irish Parliamentary Party, specially sent over by the hon. Member for Cork—namely, Mr. John Redmond—made a speech, which was reported *verbatim*, on the concluding day of the Conference. That speech, we are told, was not an impromptu speech, but carefully prepared, and in it he said—"It will be the duty of the Irish Members to make the government of England in Ireland impossible." Do you adopt that? Why do you not answer? I want an answer. Do you adopt it?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, with the leave of the House, whether he will be good enough to give the context of that speech, inasmuch as it is possible to take a single sentence from any speech and distort its meaning?

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. J. Redmond is reported to have made what all the reports call a fiery speech. It contains many other statements equally strong.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Read the whole speech, then.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: I thought that the intention of the hon. Member was *bonâ fide*. I was going to say that the immediate context of the passage I have quoted was that—"It is impossible for England to govern Ireland;" and then there follows the paragraph which I quoted—"It will be our duty to make it impossible."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: That is, not England alone.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: It is open to the hon. Member to read the whole speech if he likes, and as far as I am concerned I hope he will do so. But, in the meantime, I ask the Irish Members seriously to consider the question—"Do they adopt that policy of their delegate, or do they repudiate it?" If they adopt it, then I say we shall look with suspicion at the accounts which may come to us in the autumn of the inability of the tenants to pay the rent.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Read the whole speech to us; we do not want a bit only.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: If the Irish Members repudiate the speech they must repudiate Mr. J. Redmond also, and they must likewise repudiate the money which is subscribed on the basis of this statement. Well, Sir, these are the main points which seem to me to be in favour of the contention that the judicial rents should not be disturbed. But there are very strong arguments on the other side. I do not think anyone will deny that there has been a great fall in the prices of almost all the chief produce of Ireland since the judicial rents were fixed. That fall may be variously estimated; but I, myself, should think that it represents from 20 to 30 per cent. Now, in case the judicial rents were fixed upon the basis of the prices at the time when they were fair rents, then they must necessarily be unfair rents now. On the other hand, it is alleged that the Commissioners took into account the possibility of a reduction. [An hon. MEMBER: No.] And I think it is probable that what the Commissioners did was to fix what I should call a fair average rent, having regard to ordinary fluctuations. But, Sir, that is not a sufficient answer. Is the present an ordinary fluctuation? Do you believe that the present fall is permanent, or only temporary? If it is a permanent fall, then, clearly, the rents are not fair, because unless you suppose the prices will be as much above as they have been below the average, the average will never be reached. Unless some day or other the prices will be much higher than I am afraid they are now below the average, the average will not be reached. If, on the contrary, you believe that such a fluctuation is likely in the future, and the present prices are temporary and exceptional, then I do not see why you should object to the principle of a sliding scale, which would give immediate relief to the tenant in time of need, and would give a prospect of future profit to the landlord. The conclusion I come to is this. I do not contend, in the face of insufficient information, that it would be possible to do what the hon. Gentleman suggests—namely, establish immediately a sliding scale throughout the whole of Ireland. It would be necessary to make careful inquiry before any arrangement of the kind could be carried out. But I do hope the Commission will give the matter careful consideration, and I, for one, should not be at all sorry if the suggestions of the hon. Member for Cork were finally adopted. At all events, I do not admit for a moment that there is any sanctity about judicial or any other rents. If rents cannot be paid so as to leave a fair subsistence to the tenants, there is no doubt the landlord must bear the loss. It is imputed to the Government that they have said that under no conceivable circumstances will they touch judicial rents, even if the Commission were to report in favour of reduction. But my own impression is quite different. I have not understood that the Government pledge themselves in such a way as to the future. It would be very unreasonable that they should do so. I am quite certain that if any Commission reported in the sense I have suggested, no Government would take the responsibility of maintaining judicial rents which the Commission reported, after full inquiry, to be too high. All I understand the Government to say is that in the meantime, pending inquiry, it is their business to maintain the authority of the law. If that is a crime, there are no greater criminals than those who sit on this Bench. The Governments of which I have been a Member have again and again expressed the same doctrine—my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), Lord Selborne, and the late Prime Minister himself, in reference to Ireland, and the circumstances connected with the Crofter movement, laid down the doctrine that, pending inquiry into an alteration of the law, it is the prime duty of every Government to maintain the law. Well, Sir, the hon. Member for Cork said—and this is a thing which made a great impression on the House—that evictions would go on, and that while these Commissioners were considering the crisis would arise, and that we should have difficulties upon us before we had considered how to remedy the evil. The hon. Member for Cork proposes, in order to deal with this state of things, that evictions should be stayed upon certain conditions which he laid down. I was rather surprised to find that he was supported in this contention by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. John Morley). My right hon. Friend has come to the conclusion, after carefully considering the question, that it would be wise to give to the Courts which are charged with the duty of issuing process for eviction some equitable jurisdiction to decide whether an eviction ought to take place or not. I am glad my right hon. Friend has come to that conclusion, and that the hon. Member for Cork has adopted it. But why did they not give me more encouragement when I proposed it in the month of April? In the month of April I proposed a plan of staying evictions—I do not say whether I was right or wrong—but I proposed that evictions should be stayed, and I had in my mind exactly the same idea as my right hon. Friend has put forward—namely, that it should be done by giving the Court some kind of equitable jurisdiction. I proposed at the same time something else to which very likely a greater objection would apply. In order to facilitate a proposal of that kind, I suggested that in the meantime to such landlords as might require it a portion of the rent due should be lent to them as a first charge on the land. That might have involved a loan of a million or two, or by extreme calculation it might have reached £4,000,000. I think it would have been as certain as Consols, as I only proposed that a portion equivalent to a fourth of the year's rent should be advanced, because I only proposed that a portion of the half-year's rent should be advanced. No one could say that would not be a safe security, and it was proposed in order to meet a difficulty. But that was not an essential part of the scheme. How did my right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary receive that proposal? He described it as "the most extraordinary ever propounded by a man of my eminence and character." My right hon. Friend said I proposed first to pass an Act to stay evictions, which would not be passed in a hurry. That statement was received with loud cheers and laughter by the Home Rule Members. My right hon. Friend added that the Act I proposed was to remain in force for six months, and at the end of that time, if things were not quiet, another Act was to be passed. That was not my proposal, but it was attributed to me by my right hon. Friend. The landlords, meantime, he said, were to have their rents lent to them out of our money. Now, what I want to know is this—I think my right hon. Friend hit the blot in my proposal. I think the proposal was a just proposal. I am of the same opinion still. I wish the Government could have seen their way to treat the proposal for giving some equitable jurisdiction, so as to satisfy the people of England that if evictions took place they only occurred in the case of men who can pay and will not pay and are unwilling to pay, and not in the case of unfortunate men who are unable to pay. My right hon. Friend put his finger upon the blot in my proposal when he said that to pass legislation of that kind would be no slight difficulty in the present temper of the House. If the proposal were made what security was there that it would be accepted? I recollect what happened at the time of the Compensation for Disturbances Bill, when, in similar circumstances, a demand was made to us by the Irish Members to interrupt the course of Business in order to introduce a Bill dealing with a temporary difficulty. We consented, but what happened? Throughout the progress of that Bill we received from the Irish Members no assistance. There was continual obstruction and opposition, and at last they moved an Amendment against the third reading of the Bill. The Bill was introduced by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). There was no gratitude for it although it was brought in in compliance with their demand. They rendered no assistance in passing it, and only made it a peg on which to hang continued and excessive discussion. I cannot help saying that, although I regret very much that the Government are not able to deal with this matter, I cannot blame them for it. In the face of such a precedent as that I cannot expect them to undertake complicated legislation of this kind, which would involve them and the House in protracted debates, which in the end might possibly, after all, prove entirely fruitless. Well, Sir, in conclusion, I venture to think that, at any rate, this controversy has brought the real issue clearly before the House. You have, on the one side, in reference to the whole of the Irish difficulty, those Irishmen and Englishmen whose object it is to establish a Statutory Parliament in Ireland, or, as some of them prefer, to make Ireland an independent country, and whose policy it is to make, in the meantime, the administration of affairs in Ireland by England impossible. I think that if any section of the Liberal Party shall be found permanently to commit itself to such an unpatriotic policy as that, it will suffer seriously in the opinion of the constituencies, and that it will wander for many years in the wilderness before it sees the promised land. On the other side, you have those who—to whatever Party they belong, or in whatever part of the House they may sit—believe in the supreme necessity of maintaining the effective Union between the Three Kingdoms, and who, with that object, are prepared to sustain the verdict of the constituencies. For my own part, I would say that if ever the people of this country should weary of the excessive burden of the mighty Empire that has been bequeathed to them by their ancestors, if they should ever be ready to acknowledge their incapacity to fulfil the obligations which attend upon such an inheritance, then I would rather a hundredfold that, instead of halting between two opinions, they should accept the logical sequence of the humiliating position, that they should yield wholly to their victors, that they should let Ireland go and become what the hon. Member for Cork once said he wished to make her—namely, independent among the nations of the world. Yes, Sir; but if the people of this country are not so craven in spirit, if they are not so willing to repudiate the obligations of a great nation, if they are not willing to betray those who have trusted to their good faith and honour, then I say that it is our duty—it is the duty of this Imperial Parliament—to recognize the position, and while, on the one hand, maintaining the cause of social order in that great contest between law and sheer lawlessness which was once so eloquently described by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian in the speech he delivered at Leeds—while doing that, on the one hand, to endeavour, on the other, in every way to promote the material prosperity and the happiness of the people of Ireland, and to do for that people, as forming part of the United Kingdom, all or more than all that an Irish Parliament sitting in Dublin could reasonably and justly be expected to do. It is because I believe that the policy of the Government, as it has been shadowed forth to us, tends in this direction, and has these objects, that I am prepared to wait until it has been fully developed, and that, when it has been developed, I am prepared to give it a fair and a favourable consideration.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.): Mr. Speaker, my right hon. Friend suffered some inconvenience, which I regret, from the interruptions which prevented him from delivering his speech before the dinner hour. I hope he considers that he has been more than recompensed by the cheers with which he has been greeted from the opposite side of the House. My right hon. Friend's speech seemed to me to be much less concerned with the Amendment which is before the House than full of endeavour to justify himself for his separation from the late Government, and for the course which he took —I believe one of some considerable importance in the weight of the support he gave to hon. Gentleman sitting on the opposite side of the House. But, Sir, I say, and I say it with all seriousness, that I doubt whether any hon. Member can recall any other speech made in such circumstances as the present that was so clearly marked by a tone of personal bitterness. It was a speech—I am sorry to say this, but I say it because I feel it—it was a speech in the course of which my right hon. Friend seemed to seek for and obtained the cheers of hon. Members opposite by language insulting—[*Cries of* "No!" "Withdraw!" *and* "Order!"]—insulting to his former Colleagues and Friends sitting on this side of the House. I do not desire to say that my right hon. Friend intentionally pursued that course. It may be that he was betrayed into it by the intensity of personal feeling which possesses him, and it may also be that he has been sinned against himself in the same way in other places. But I think it is too much to expect forbearance from those who sit on this side of the House when my right hon. Friend selects a word to characterize the great bulk of the Liberal Party, to which Party he still professes to belong, which he must have known to be the most objectionable which he could have applied to them. [*Interruption.*] I shall feel obliged to my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James) if he will refrain from indulging in stage whispers. Sir, my right hon. Friend says that we are the party of Separatists. Hon. Members opposite may be entitled to say that. We have always regarded them as our political opponents, although we may not always have carried on our controversies with freedom from recrimination; but I want to know what right has a former Colleague and Friend of Gentlemen on this Bench, whose intentions and motives he must know, to dub that Party with a phrase which he knows to be considered by them insulting? Sir, we are not Separatists. We believe that you (pointing to the Ministerial Benches) and your allies are the Separatists; and so far as my right hon. Friend is concerned, if he were less assured of his own complete wisdom than he is, it might have given him some momentary doubt in that wisdom to note the fact that by three to one the Liberal Party in this House are opposed to him. But, Sir, my right hon. Friend did not stop at doing all he could to give pain to his former associates; he went further. With the zeal of a new convert he out-Heroded Herod, and he defended the policy of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite along the whole line. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Ministerial Benches.*] Nay, more, he protested against being confined to that part of the defence of the policy of the Government which was ruled to be at all relevant to the Amendment. [*Renewed Ministerial cheers.*] I am glad to see that hon. Gentlemen opposite appreciate the position. My right hon. Friend betrayed an almost parental fondness for a particular part of that policy. He defended that policy with so much cordiality and so much tenderness as to make one suspect that his relationship to it was of the very closest and most intimate character. Now, Sir, as regards the Amendment before the House, my right hon. Friend said very little, but what he did say was very remarkable. He said that the Amendment was divided into two parts, to neither of which had he any objection in itself, but the Amendment was incomplete, and therefore he could not support it, for it led to no definite object; and then he went on to say, in very emphatic language, that he would support no Amendment, whatever that Amendment was, which would have the effect of displacing the Government opposite, and replacing it by a Government which he designated the Government of the Separatist Party. May I suggest respectfully to my right hon. Friend that he might have saved the House and himself some time, for his position is that he intends to vote for the Government and against any proposition which comes from this side of the House, however just and right and politic that proposition may be. My right hon. Friend might have declared his policy in a single sentence, and that is that he will vote against his Party and with the Party opposite. My right hon. Friend has condescended to submit to the House his views as to the issue of the late Elections. It would not be proper for me in that regard to follow him at any length, beyond saying this—that, looking at the difficulties with which this question of the government of Ireland is surrounded, the comparative suddenness, I must admit, with which the policy of the late Government was introduced, the amount of ignorance or want of knowledge which prevailed, the fruitful theme that it presented for misrepresentation, aye, and for appeals to prejudice of race and of religion, it is to me a marvel, not that that policy was for a time delayed—for I cannot say that it was defeated—but that so large a number of the political minds of England gave their adhesion to it. My right hon. Friend went on, in some little detail, to criticize the Amendment, and, as I am arguing upon the Amendment, let me recall the attention of the House to what it is. It consists, as has been said, of two parts, the first of which refers to and alleges a fall in the agricultural prices, and then it goes on to state that—

> "The greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing wide-spread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order, will be the result."

I wish to ask permission to say a few words, and only a few words, on the closing paragraph, and I will endeavour, as far as I can, to avoid repeating what has been said by previous speakers. First of all, is that statement true? and, secondly, is it politic and right that the words should appear in the Address in the reply to the Speech from the Throne? Well, Sir, it is hardly denied that the statement is true. [An hon. MEMBER: No.] I hear one hon. Member say "No." I said it is "hardly" denied that the statement is true. That is proved first, so far as the authority of my right hon. Friend is concerned, by the admission of my right hon. Friend himself. But he did not carry his admission to the extent that he did in April last. In April last, in a speech to which he has referred, he stated that the fall in the prices of agricultural produce was from 20 to 40 per cent.

MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I said 20 to 30 per cent.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.): I beg my right hon. Friend's pardon if I am wrong; but I am not referring to my right hon. Friend's statement to-night. In April my right hon. Friend certainly spoke of a fall of 40 per cent. My right hon. Friend went further on that occasion, because he gave his own opinion, and he gave what seemed to me good reason, or, at all events, a strong reason, for that opinion—that the bottom had not, so to speak, been reached, and that a future fall might probably be expected; and he pointed to the insecurity of an arrangement based on the foundation of existing rents. Further, let me call the attention of hon. Members opposite to evidence from Ireland itself, and not evidence from the Southern and Western parts of the country only, or from hon. Members below the Gangway. I am sorry not to see the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) in his place; but I may state to the House that over the whole of Ulster there are associations for the protection of the rights of the tenants—not portions of the Land League, though I believe that, too, has its branches—and that these associations for the protection of the rights of the tenant farmers in Ulster—Presbyterian and Protestant tenant farmers principally—have passed resolutions declaring that the judicial rents are, in the circumstances of this time, excessive and impossible to pay. But I wish to point out one fact which, I think, has not been mentioned in this connection, but which seems to me to be very important to bear in mind, and it is this—the reductions that have been made by the judicial process in Ireland may be said to be about 17 to 18 per cent. Now, from what rents were those reductions made? I wish the House to note this fact. They were made from the rents fixed at the time when, by the admission of Parliament, the landlord and tenant were not able to deal on equal terms, and from rents fixed at the time when the landlords were claiming and were exercising the right of increasing the rents upon the tenants' avowed improvements; in other words, the rents which the Judicial Commission applied themselves to reconsider were rents based, in large measure at least, upon a comprehension and inclusion of the tenants' improvements. When you take that fact in mind, and take also the fact that in England voluntary reductions have been made to a much higher figure and to a very large extent, it will be apparent that reductions in England of 15 or 20 or 30 per cent upon the rents which the tenants paid, the landlords having at the same time to pay out of their own pockets yearly, or as occasion may arise, towards the maintenance and erection of farm buildings and other like improvements, it will be seen that reductions in England of 20 per cent will be equal to reductions in Ireland of 30, or above 30, per cent. That seems to me to be a consideration of some importance, especially when it is borne in mind—and I hope the House will forgive me for just dwelling upon this for one moment—that the Bessborough Commission found the fact to be that of the whole of the improvements which are made upon Irish agricultural land some 89 per cent are made by the tenants, and 11 per cent only by the landlords. Well, Sir, to return to the Amendment, can it be doubted that in circumstances such as these the judicial rents are too high? Can it be doubted that if the landlord insists upon his full pound of flesh the evictions which would follow upon that course would be a source of serious danger to the public peace? I think none of these things can be doubted. Then, is it politic that these facts should appear in the form suggested in the Amendment to the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne? I think it is right and politic that they should, and I will tell the House why. It is not proposed by the Government to bring in a Bill of the nature which my right hon. Friend in April last suggested—I mean a Bill for the temporary staying of evictions throughout the country. I believe that was a generous and well-meant proposition on the part of my right hon. Friend, although I cannot forget that it was a bid made by my right hon. Friend in opposition to the Bill for the Better Government of Ireland and the Land Purchase Scheme of the late Government. I admit that there are great difficulties in the way of a general measure of that kind. If that be admitted, and if it be further admitted that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant would have great difficulty in refusing the aid of the Executive in carrying out legal processes, except, indeed, in the very gravest extremity, in which he would be justified in coming to this House and asking for an indemnity for what he had done—if these two things be admitted, is it not right that in some form or other an expression of this, the representative House of Parliament, should go forth to Ireland, that in the circumstances of the present time the rights of the Irish landlords, according to the letter, should be exercised with moderation and with forbearance? Sir, I regard this Amendment very much as standing in the place of the appeal which Lord Carnarvon, to his credit, made to the Irish landlords in 1885. I consider it the more necessary, because of the language used by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) in unfolding the policy of the Government. I do not desire for one moment to have it suggested that by what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he wished to urge the Irish landlords to exact their extreme rights—I do not think he did—but I am speaking of the effect of what he said, and I do not doubt for one instant what the effect of what he said will be upon the minds of a great many Irish landlords. They will say—"Whatever the local opinion in Ireland is we regard it not; we look to the public opinion in England." And if they find leading public opinion in England telling them that they are to be secured in their legal rights, and that England will stand by them with the full force of the Executive, the effect upon them must be to prevent them using that forbearance and that withholding of their full powers which otherwise they might exercise. Well, then, it is said that the law in Ireland is much more favourable to the tenant than the law is in England. The payment of rent has been treated by some hon. and learned Friends of mine as a strictly legal obligation. They say—"You must either pay the rent or go; you must either pay the rent, or let someone else come in to pay it. I do not know how it strikes hon. Gentlemen opposite; but I think if they dwell upon the question it will strike them as it strikes me, that in the mind of every man who considers the question of the rent of agricultural land there is a justifiable distinction to be drawn between an agricultural rent contract and other contracts. It is this—that at the bottom of the sentiment of the public mind there is a recurrence of that which is the true economic foundation for the payment of rent—namely, that the landlord is entitled, not to absolute payment in all events, but to a proportion of the produce of the land, the support of the man who tills the land being the first charge upon the land. That is the principle which hon. Members opposite know is the Common Law of Scotland to this day, which is the law in many parts of Europe to this day, and which, whether we wish it or not, has unquestionably affected the public mind in England, as shown by the transactions in relation to land in England, and the forbearance of landlords in England, who take into consideration, not whether the tenant is absolutely able to pay out of his own private resources, but whether the land is able to pay the rent. When I come to consider the policy suggested by the Government in relation to this matter I have great difficulty in appreciating it. And here let me say, with all sincerity, that I do not in the very least, by anything I am now saying, or by the support I am giving to this Amendment, desire to embarrass the Government on this occasion. I think, if the truth were spoken, the Government would perhaps recognize that in the free criticism which has proceeded from this side of the House upon the foreshadowing of their policy observations have been made which may be of considerable value to them. When the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), explaining in more detail the policy of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), distinguished between judicial rents and non-judicial rents, I confess I did not follow the aim and object of the policy he propounded so far as any relief of the Irish tenantry was concerned. As regards judicial rents, there is to be an inquiry; but that inquiry is not to be with a view to the revision or remission of those judicial rents. In some way which I do not quite understand, and on which we have only an imperfect light shed by the statement attributed to the noble Marquess the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) in "another place," if it should turn out that the judicial rents have been fixed too high, whatever happens to the tenant the landlord is not to lose. This is the only clear idea I have of the policy of the Government. How this can be said to be any relief to the tenant, how it can be said to meet the case of exceptional fall in the price of agricultural produce, I entirely fail to see. Well, then, as regards rents which, for distinction, may be called non-judicial rents, fixed by ordinary agreement, the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary says there is a section in the Act of Parliament which enables the tenant to apply to the Court to stay. Has the right hon. Baronet inquired in how many cases that section was availed of? I think that if he consults the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) he will be told that in the case of those who most need protection, the small tenants, there has not been one application to the Court; that the applications under the staying section have been exceedingly few; and that in the cases in which applications have been made the Court, owing to the wording of the section, has often found itself unable to grant the prayer of the applicants. But, further, the practical answer is that the expense and delay involved have rendered the section of no avail as a means of protection to the tenant. Then my right hon. and learned Friend the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) certainly advanced a still more extraordinary argument. Pointing to the statement made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), that the important time of the year—a critical time it was called—would occur in November, my right hon. and learned Friend said—"Oh, that it quite a mistake, because no decree could be obtained for the November rent until the following January." Let me point out the entire misconception under which the right hon. and learned Gentleman labours. The arrears will be accumulating if the tenants cannot pay the rent, and the Act applies to the rent in arrear now, for which ejectment can be brought if one year's rent be in arrear. Then, it is said, the landlords in Ireland may be trusted to do what is right. I have never made an indiscriminate attack upon the Irish landlords; and I will only say of them that the legislation of this couutry—the legislation of 1870 and 1881, and the proceedings which followed upon it—have shown that, in the opinion of Parliament, the Irish landlords were not to be completely trusted. The fact is that in part they are the victims of a state of things which was not of their creation. They are suffering to-day for sins not of their committal. Many of them are impoverished themselves, and are unable to make concessions which men of larger means would make; but there is—upon which I lay great emphasis—there is an absence in Ireland of that strong local, searching, and thorough public opinion which is stronger than the law in England, and which controls the exercise of literal legal right. This public opinion is an important factor in social life in England; but, for reasons which I will not here dwell upon, it is wanting in Ireland. I now leave the first part of the Amendment, and I will say, with the permission of the House, only a word or two upon the second branch of it. That branch is one which deprecates any attempt to saddle any loss which may arise to the owners of land by the inability of the tenants to pay the present rent upon the taxpayers of Great Britain. I will take leave to say that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) did go out of his way—I will not say intentionally, but unnecessarily out of his way—in dealing with this Amendment to have a fling at the Purchase Scheme of the late Government; and in doing so I think I shall show the House, and even satisfy him that, in some important particulars, he has mis-stated what that scheme was. In the first place, what is this clause in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork? What relation has it in any way to any State-aided

Purchase Scheme of the late Government? What is said here is this—and this is in reference to a statement attributed to the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) in "another place"—that if, after inquiry into the judicial rents, it should be found that the judicial rents are too high, then, where there are any remissions to the tenants, in the scheme of purchase by the State there shall be payment to the landlord upon the basis of the unjust rent. Now, will my right hon. Friend say that that is a sound proposition? He cannot. It would be utterly inconsistent not only with what he has said on previous occasions, but with his argument to-night, because it would be, in effect, compensating the landlord for the fictitious and untrue value put upon his property by excessive judicial rents. Well, but my right hon. Friend says, in reference to those rents—"Oh, the Commissioners were appointed, and I have no doubt they looked to the average." There is no doubt they did look to the average; but then, if they looked to the average, it must have been to the average of what had gone before; it could not be the average of what was to follow, and that is explained very clearly by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Mahony) sitting below the Gangway, who was formerly a Sub-Commissioner himself, and who said that what the practice had been was to take the average of five or six years preceding the fixing of the rent. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Mahony) went on to show, by figures, that from the average of agricultural produce for those six years, contrasted with the present time and the two or three years which have succeeded the fixing of the judicial rents, there have been falls of from 20 to 42 per cent. Well, but my right hon. Friend mis-stated, as I conceive, the effect of the Land Purchase Scheme of the late Government. He seemed to think that the Land Scheme was necessarily based upon purchase at the judicial rent. My right hon. Friend will excuse me for saying that is not correct. It was not taken upon that basis absolutely. There was unquestionably what I may call a maximum of 20 years' purchase upon the net rent, and there was a minimum so low that no mention was made of it—it might have been two, three, four, five, or six years' purchase. I pass from that, and have one or two other words only to say. I am not going into a defence of the Purchase Scheme of the late Government. I never felt entirely in love with that scheme, and I have not expressed a very ardent affection for it here or elsewhere; but I did think—and I think still—that it was practically free from risk to the British taxpayer; and, even if it were not entirely so, I thought that, for the settlement of a great national, as well as a great social, question, it was worth making an effort, even if there should be appreciable risks to be borne by the English and Scotch and Welsh taxpayers. I think, further, that my right hon. Friend (Mr. Chamberlain) might have accepted the correction of my right hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) upon the question of the margin of security. It was, no doubt, subject to prior charges, but it was practically the security of the whole Revenues of the country and of the whole land of the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in introducing the Land Scheme of the late Government, said the land rents which the State authority would levy would amount to a net rental of £2,500,000; and he pointed out that there was the highest possible security for vigilance in levying the rents—firstly, in its sense of right; secondly, in its sense of prudence; and, thirdly, in its sense of necessity. In my opinion, my right hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was justified in saying that after the prior charges had been defrayed there would be left a margin of somewhere about £2,000,000.

Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN: I think my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Charles Russell) did not understand what I said, and I am bound to say I did not understand the interruption of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton; but I think he will admit I apologized for any hasty expression of mine in reference to it. What I said was this—that the late Prime Minister said, and said truly, that the whole of the Revenues of Ireland were security for these rents; but then I pointed out that of those whole Revenues only the Customs and Excise were under the control of the Imperial Parliament, and it was only those to which I can refer as bearing the slightest security, and it was upon them I said it was a first mortgage which left only £200,000 value.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL: My right hon. Friend forgets that there was a provision in the scheme to the effect that so long as indebtedness to the British Treasury continued, all the payments were to go through the hands of an Imperial authority—namely, the Receiver General. Allow me to say in this connection that the great merit of that scheme—a merit which I think will be more recognized hereafter than now—was that so far from following the precedent of previous land schemes in dealings between the English Executive, representing the British Treasury on the one hand, and individual tenants and individual landlords on the other hand, for the first time it created a central Local Authority which was, if I may use the expression, a buffer between the landlord and tenant on the one hand, and the British Executive on the other—a Central Authority which for the justification of its own existence, not to say of its credit in the face of the world, was placed in a position in which it was bound to exert, and must exert, on the local public opinion in Ireland the strongest moral pressure for the fulfilment of the obligations under it. But we are not discussing that measure, and I will just make this concluding comment upon the general outline of policy sketched by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have never thought—I do not think it now—fair to attempt to pin the Government to the details of a policy which has only been sketched. I think the noble Lord who leads this House probably is himself to blame for his indiscretion—if it is indiscretion—in inviting criticism by the statement of policy which enlarged and amplified the Queen's Speech. Certainly, this policy of the Government is marked by one extraordinary feature. I do not say that this feature is one which is peculiar to the present Government, for I am afraid it is to be found in the policy of many preceding Governments. We are here dealing with a system of government by representation which we all prize; and yet in the case of Ireland you are inaugurating a policy which, so far as you have sketched it, has not received the approval of a single Representative from Ireland—of those who represent the great majority of the Irish people. Your policy has not been approved by any one of the Representatives of four-fifths of the Irish people—nay more, in your search for information, in your wide field of Commissions, I have not heard it said that you have made arrangements, or contemplate arrangements, for the representation of the Irish Members upon those Commissions. No; you are following the old and fatal policy of fashioning for yourselves a policy for Ireland. You are giving Ireland what you in your wisdom think she ought to take, and not consulting those who ought best to know her wants and wishes. Well, Sir, the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) said—"Why should my Friends on this side of the House be impatient for the policy of the Government; why should they not wait? If the policy which they maintain and contend for—namely, the policy of the right of the Irish people to govern themselves—be just and true, that policy must and will prevail." We agree with the noble Lord. We believe our policy to be just and true. We believe it will prevail. We believe that the mists and clouds of prejudice will be soon dispelled; and I, for one, believe that the day is not very far distant when we shall be looking back upon the settlement of this question with amazement—amazement that we should have given way to such dire forebodings, just as you look back with amazement at the forebodings of your Predecessors when any great Constitutional change has been effected. I will say this only in conclusion. My right hon. Friend, in his peroration, spoke of the day—the dismal day, I think he called it—of humiliation, when a craven policy of despair will have taken possession of the minds of British statesmen, and when the Irish demands will be yielded under that feeling of despair. Despair of what? I hope it may be a policy of despair indeed, but a policy of despair of the old methods; a policy of despair of the methods by which you have set at naught and disregarded the great popular will and the great popular wish; despair of a policy by which you have thrust your rule on the people by force and fear; not a policy by which you have sought to win the Irish people to the side of law, and by which you might rule them through affection. And how are you to do that best? By carrying out that which I maintain to be, notwithstanding what my right hon. Friend may now say and think, a true Liberal principle, respecting the wishes and wants of those over whom you rule. When my right hon. Friend talks of humiliation, I ask if it would have been a humiliation had the Advisers of George III. recognized the rights of the Colonies of America to govern themselves? Was it a humiliation to give to the Canadians the right to rule themselves? No, Sir; there is no humiliation in doing justice; and when a demand is made, as this demand is made, in a spirit of friendly feeling with England, in a spirit in which it is hoped that bygones may be bygones, and that the ill-treatment of years may be forgotten, is not the statesmanship of England, is not the spirit of public men on both sides, equal to the task of devising a policy by which the Irish people may be permitted to govern themselves—a policy which would not imperil, but would give added strength and dignity to the Empire?

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I am bound to say that I feel in a difficult position as regards this Motion. I would be most anxious myself to avoid even the commencement of anything like a wrangling controversy with any Party in this House on Motions for Adjournment; but I feel bound to remind the House of the leading facts of the case. The Amendment was moved on Tuesday, and I think I shall not be contradicted when I say that all Parties in this House have very fully laid their views with regard to it before the House; and, of all Parties, I do not think that the Irish Party can say that their views have not been fully placed before us. But what the Government feel strongly is this—having regard to the period of the year at which we have arrived, and the very large amount of Public Business which still remains before the House, and which it is indispensable that the House should get through, they would be very reluctant to consent to any further prolongation of the debate, unless, either by appealing to the right hon. Gentleman who leads the Opposition, or to any hon. Gentleman below the Gangway who is able to speak with authority as to the intentions of those who follow the hon. Member for the City of Cork—unless we can get from one or other of those Gentlemen a clear and honourable undertaking that if the Government do not resist the Motion for Adjournment they may count on the debate on the present Amendment terminating to-morrow evening. Without that undertaking I must ask the House to continue.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): The noble Lord has said truly that the debate on the Address has extended to a considerable length, although I think not to a greater length than has been the case in former years. But the noble Lord must not blame the House for that. I am not going to say anything against the course taken, which, no doubt, has been taken for reasons which appeared to them sufficient; but it was open to them to have said—"Parliament meets in February next, and we intend to reserve till then any statement as to our policy." That course they did not take, and I have no doubt they had good reasons for not taking it. But a noble Lord in "another place" stated in very definite outline the whole policy affecting Ireland, both in the present and in the immediate future. Under the circumstances, then, it was almost inevitable that the character of that policy should have led to a very extensive debate. Certainly, however, so far as I, and I believe most hon. Members on this side of the House are concerned, there will be every desire to confine the debate within reasonable limits. I think the proposal of the noble Lord's a fair one, and that it should be accepted—namely, that the debate on this Amendment should be brought to a termination to-morrow night.

MR. SEXTON (Sligo, S., and Belfast, W.): There is no one below the Gangway competent to pledge the Leader of this Party in his absence. But, for my own part, I think the proposal of the noble Lord a fair one, and, with the consent of my Colleagues, am willing to agree to it.

MR. PICTON (Leicester): I beg to state that it is not alone the Representatives of Irish constituencies who are concerned in this question. There is a considerable number of Radical Members who have not yet been able to express their views upon the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS.

Select Committee on Standing Orders *nominated* of,—Mr. DWYER GRAY, Mr. HALSEY, Mr. WILLIAM LOWTHER, Sir JOHN MOWBRAY, Colonel NOLAN, Mr. CRAIG SELLAR, Mr. STANSFELD, and Mr. WHITBREAD.

PARLIAMENT—SELECTION.

Committee of Selection *nominated* of, —Dr. CAMERON, Lord EDWARD CAVENDISH, Mr. CUBITT, Mr. ILLINGWORTH, Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY, Sir ARCHIBALD ORR EWING, Mr. WHITBREAD, and the CHAIRMAN of the SELECT COMMITTEE on Standing Orders.

SHOP HOURS REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to regulate the Hours of Labour in Shops, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cameron Corbett, and Mr. Macnaghten.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 40.]

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

Committee *appointed,* "to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, in the department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House:"—Committee to consist of Sixteen Members:—Mr. A. H. ACLAND, Mr. AGG-GARDNER, Mr. BIGGAR, Mr. WILLIAM CORBET, Baron DIMSDALE, Mr. FENWICK, Mr. FLOWER, General GOLDSWORTHY, Mr. HERBERT, Viscount LEWISHAM, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARJORIBANKS, Mr. RICHARD POWER, Baron de ROTHSCHILD, Mr. SHEIL, and Mr. YERBURGH *nominated* Members of the Committee; Five to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 27*th August,* 1886.

MINUTES.] — NEW MEMBER SWORN — Alexander Weston Jarvis, esquire, *for* the Borough of King's Lynn.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of Twelve Members.

Ordered, That Sir EDWARD BIRKBECK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CUBITT, and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH be added to the Committee.

Ordered, That so much of Standing Order No. 91 as fixes Five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the Session, Three be the quorum of the Committee.—(*Sir John Mowbray*).

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN: I was not in the House last night when the Secretary of State for War made the statement that—

> "It is the rule of the Ordnance Department to require any officers on entering it to cease to retain any interest in any manufacturing firm which may be, or are likely to be, War Office contractors;".

but as the right hon. Gentleman has made that statement, I beg to give Notice that I shall withdraw the Motion with reference to the Ordnance Department which now stands in my name.

QUESTIONS.

TITHE COMMUTATION ACT, 1836— "THE TITHE WAR IN WALES."

MR. J. G. HUBBARD (London) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the statements contained in an article in the *Daily News* of the 23rd August, headed "The Tithe War in Wales," are founded on fact; whether tithe rent-charge is a legal primary charge upon lands, subject to no other variation than that provided by the Commutation Act of 1836; whether he can state the per-centage of the original commutation now payable under the heavy fall of prices on the septennial average; whether the demand of a further abatement from the tithe of 25 per cent. in the parish of Llanarmon was accompanied by threats; and, whether he will therefore move the proper authorities to take the necessary measures for protecting the clergy from annoyance?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir; I am informed that the article to which my right hon. Friend refers is founded on fact, and that the statements therein are true. Tithe rent-charge, subject only to the variation provided by the Act of 1836, is a legal charge upon lands. I am informed by the Land Commissioners that the amount payable on the septennial average for the year 1886 in respect of each £100 of tithe rent-charge as commuted is something over £90, or about 9½ per cent reduction from the original commutation. The duty of maintaining order rests upon the Local Authorities; if the clergy require protection I have no doubt it will be afforded to them.

ARMY—CANTEENS.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can inform the House in how many cases Committees managing canteens in the Army throw open the supplies for these canteens to public competition, as recommended by his immediate predecessor in the office of Secretary for War, in replies to Questions put to that Right honourable Gentleman in the last Parliament; and, whether he will take any measures to encourage the adoption of the system generally?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Reports, which were specially called for, show that nearly all the principal canteens obtain their chief supplies either locally or from private firms; but I have no information as to public competition. My Predecessor certainly expressed an opinion in favour of that system; but he, at the same time, stated explicitly that he did not think it desirable that the managementof canteens should be interfered with by any directions on the subject. I agree with that view.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—ATTEMPTED DISTURBANCE AT GILFORD, CO. ARMAGH.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If by direction of Captain O'Brien, J.P., an Orange drumming party, principally from Tanderagee, paid a visit to Gilford, and made every effort to create a riot; but, failing in their endeavour, attacked a young married woman named Bridget Conlon, kicked and beat her in the most savage manner; whether any arrests were made; and, what steps were taken to bring the perpetrators to justice?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he was informed that the band reached Gilford on the 7th instant, but nothing was known as to Captain O'Brien having sent it. A woman was assaulted, but not seriously. A man named Davidson was arrested for the assault. The case was heard at the Petty Sessions, and dismissed. As the woman took proceedings the police did not interfere.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — MR. GRAY, OF GLENANN, CO. ARMAGH.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. Gray, of Glenann, county Armagh, some time ago made a composition with his creditors; and, if so, will he be further retained in the commission of the peace and ex-officio guardianship of the poor?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, the records of the Court of Bankruptcy for several years had been searched and no trace had been found of any record in support of the allegation in the Question. He believed there were two Mr. Grays in the Commission of the Peace at Armagh; but nothing of the kind had been found in reference to either of them.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. SINCLAIR, NEWRY.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. Sinclair, of Newry, some time ago made a composition with his creditors; and, if so, will he still be retained in the commission of the peace, guardianship of the poor, and Newry Town Commission?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the fact was as stated with regard to Mr. Sinclair. Accordingly a communication, as was usual in such cases, had been addressed to him.

WEST INDIA ISLANDS—DOMINICA.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the colonists of Dominica recently voted for annexation to the United States of America; and, if so, for what reasons; whether the Home Government offered loans to the colonists of Demerara, within the last three years, to carry on their plantations; what was the rate of interest on those loans, and when were they to be repaid; whether the offer of the Home Government was accepted by the colonists; and, if not, for what reasons; whether it is true that all, or nearly all, the lucrative Government posts in the West Indian Colonies are filled by others than colonists; whether the colonists are satisfied with this arrangement; and, if it is a fact that the colonists have to teach many of the officials how to perform their work, besides providing their salaries by taxation?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): In answer to the first Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that a Resolution in favour of annexation to the United States was proposed in the Legislative Assembly of Dominica in 1884, but was rejected. To the second, third, and fourth Questions the answer is in the negative. To the fifth and sixth Questions I may say that it is necessary to fill some of the higher offices in these Colonies by the appointment of persons from the United Kingdom or from other Colonies; but many lucrative offices are held by persons belonging to the Colony, and there is no reason to believe that any general dissatisfaction exists on the subject.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE ENNISKILLEN MAGISTRATES — "THE QUEEN v. JAMES PHAIR."

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the observations of Mr. Justice Murphy, in the case of the Queen *v.* James Phair, at the last Enniskillen Assizes, reported in *The Freeman's Journal* of the 8th July last, in the following terms:—

> "James Phair was put forward and charged with committing a serious assault on one John M'Manus, at Lisnaskea, on the 5th December;
>
> "The case was of a party nature, Phair being a Protestant and M'Manus a Roman Catholic;
>
> "His Lordship commented severely on the conduct of the magistrates at petty sessions, who entered 'no rule' in the case of two other defendants named Moore and Rowe, who were finally charged along with Phair, simply because there was a conflict of evidence as to the identity of the persons charged. His Lordship held that such cases should be returned for trial, and left for a jury, and that it was a monstrous thing for a magistrate to enter 'no rule' under the circumstances;"

who the magistrates are referred to by his Lordship; and, whether the Lord Chancellor proposes to take any action in regard to their conduct?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary has asked me to answer this Question. I am informed by the Resident Magistrate that the observations attributed to Mr. Justice Murphy are substantially correct. The magistrates referred to were Captain M'Ternan and Messrs. Trench, Creighton, Winslow, Johnston, and Westrop, who seem to have been unanimous in entering "no rule" in the case of Moore and Rowe. I do not gather from the Judge's observations that he attributed anything more to the magistrates than an error of judgment; and if that be so it would hardly be a case for action on the part of the Lord Chancellor.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Captain M'Ternan is a Resident Magistrate of experience.

NAVY—THE MEDITERRANEAN SQUADRON.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he can inform the House the names, number of guns, and men (Blue Jackets and Marines) comprising the Mediterranean Squadron, and in what manœuvres and tactics ships and men have been engaged since His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh assumed the command; whether any special arrangements exist for educating the crews in gunnery and torpedo games of war outside smooth water; and, if it is with the consent of the Admiralty that the ships are being utilized for yachting trips in the neighbourhood of Egypt and the Holy Land?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): It would only weary the House to read out all the information asked for by the hon. Member. The number of officers and men in the Mediterranean Squadron is 5,197. *The Navy List* gives the names of the various ships with the numbers of their guns. The ships and men have been engaged in such manœuvres and tactics and other service that has been considered necessary to secure efficiency; and there is no reason to doubt that the Duke of Edinburgh will, in these tactics and exercises, keep his men up to that high state of efficiency characterizing his previous commands. All necessary arrangements exist for training the crews in gunnery and torpedo work at sea. The ships of the Mediterranean Squadron are not being utilized for yachting trips in the neighbourhood of Egypt and the Holy Land, but are employed in carrying out the programme approved by the late Board of Admiralty for their autumn cruise.

JAPAN—CONCESSIONS TO GERMAN TRADERS.

MR. BROOKE ROBINSON (Dudley) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any information as to an alleged Convention between the Government of Japan and certain German Traders, giving to Germany the entire monopoly for a period of eight years of supplying all steel rails required for Japan?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): No such information has been received by Her Majesty's Government.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—LIMERICK POST OFFICE—SALARIES OF THE LETTER CARRIERS AND CLERKS.

MR. HENRY GILL (Limerick) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the maximum salary of the letter-carriers of the post office of Limerick, which is now ranked as a first-class office, is only twenty-two shillings a week, whilst that of the letter-carriers of Dublin, Belfast, &c. is thirty shillings a week; whether the duration of work is in the aggregate the same as in Limerick; whether, up to the year 1882, the salary of the sorting clerks in Limerick was only four shillings a week in advance of that of the letter-carriers, whilst now it is sixteen shillings a week in advance; whether in Limerick there are only four first-class positions amongst thirty-seven clerks in the telegraph branch, whilst in the post office branch there are nine first-class positions amongst fifteen clerks; and, if these discrepancies exist, will steps be soon taken to remedy them by raising the salaries of the letter-carriers to the same scale as in other first-class offices, and increasing the number of first-class appointments in the telegraph service?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I find that the wages granted to postmen in Limerick are the same as those given at Plymouth, Bath, Paisley, and other towns, and that they were raised in 1882 to the present amount — namely, 18*s.*, rising by 1*s.* to 22*s.* a-week. They are amply sufficient, and it is not intended to increase them further. The circumstances of the other towns referred to in the Question are different. The wages of the sorting clerks in Limerick were raised in 1881, because they were considered not sufficient for the duties performed. As regards the superior positions referred to, I have to inform the hon. Member that the number of superior appointments must be determined by the number of superior duties to be discharged, and that from time to time, as business increases, it becomes necessary to adjust the number of the higher appointments. Various alterations, consequent on the increased business arising out of the reduced rates for telegrams, are now under consideration; and it is probable that the numbers of the classes at the Limerick office will have to be examined from this point of view.

MR. HENRY GILL asked for an explanation as to the discrepancy between the letter-carriers and the sorters.

MR. RAIKES said, his answer only applied to the letter-carriers, whose wages it did not seem to him necessary to increase. He was not responsible for the increase in the case of the sorters, which had been made in 1881, for reasons which had been approved of by the late Mr. Fawcett.

TITHE COMMUTATION ACT, 1836—DISTRAINT FOR TITHE — LLANARMON PARISH.

MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the farmers of Llanarmon and similar upland parishes in Wales are suffering most heavily from a fall of nearly fifty per cent. in the price of cattle and dairy produce; whether, out of a population of 1,681 in the parish of Llanarmon, only forty or fifty attend the ministrations of the tithe-receiver; and, whether he will take the necessary measures for protecting these hill farmers, who support their own form of religious worship, from the annoyance of peremptory distraint for tithe.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): In reply to the hon. Member I have to say that I have no information at the Home Office which would show me that agricultural depression is more severely felt in Wales than in other parts of the United Kingdom, and I have no means of ascertaining what percentage of the population of Llanarmon attend the ministrations of the tithe receiver. I have further to say that I have neither the intention nor the power to interfere with the ordinary process by which legal claims to tithe are enforced.

ARMY — ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT — MANUFACTURE OF MATERIALS OF WAR.

Mr. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, What are the materials of war which Her Majesty's Government cannot obtain in this Country; if the ordinary demand for them in the future is likely to be sufficient to justify the erection of factories and machinery for their manufacture; and, further, if, in the contracts which at present are unavoidably placed with foreigners, any condition is or will be imposed as to the employment of British labour?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): A list of the materials referred to will be found in a Return (No. 228 of June 24 last) obtained by the hon. Member for North Sligo (Mr. P. M'Donald). The principal items of the Return are gunpowder, Hotchkiss machine guns, swords, and compressed meat. As regards the first item, we have had hitherto to buy a particular kind of powder, known as cocoa powder, from German firms, who have now patented the article. Our contract with them expires March 31, 1887. Some English firms are endeavouring to produce this powder, and if they succeed we shall in future be in a position to deal with them as occasion offers. One of the German firms has already established a factory in England. As regards the Hotchkiss machine guns, arrangements have been made for their manufacture hereafter in this country. As regards swords, there is practically only one English firm that now manufactures them. They have a large contract on hand at present, as a new Cavalry sword has been approved, and is being manufactured; but the ordinary demand for swords is so small that the trade have nearly abandoned it in England. As respects compressed meat, we have to buy a large quantity of corned beef at Chicago; but we took, at the same time, all we could from Australia. The English compressed corn beef is much more costly than the American, the price of the raw material being so much higher. I hope the trade will develop in our Colonies. The answer to the last paragraph is in the negative; but I hope that the facts that a powder factory has been established in England and that the Hotchkiss gun will be henceforth made in this country will increase the demand for English labour.

DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT WITH CREDITORS—LEGISLATION.

Mr. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If Her Majesty's Government will introduce, as soon as practicable, a Bill by which Deeds of Arrangement with Creditors may, by registration or otherwise, be made public, and traders be protected from dealing with insolvent persons?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): It is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to undertake any general legislation during the present Session; and I am unable to hold out any promise to the hon. Member as to the future.

THE MAURITIUS—SIR JOHN POPE HENNESSY AND MR. CLIFFORD LLOYD.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID (St. Pancras, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the differences between Sir J. Pope Hennessy and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, offer the first instance of difficulties between Sir J. Pope Hennessy and those under his orders; and, if not, in how many Colonies Sir J. Pope Hennessy has experienced similar difficulties?

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) said, before the Question was answered he wished to ask whether a majority of Representatives in the Council of the Island had not passed a vote of confidence in Sir John Pope Hennessy; whether the origination of the unfortunate state of affairs was simultaneous with the advent of Mr. Clifford Lloyd; and whether, considering the trouble which had always been brought about by Mr. Clifford Lloyd wherever he went, the Government would cancel his present appointment to the Seychelles Islands, and transfer him to a more isolated and secluded portion of Her Majesty's Dominions?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): In reply to the last part of the Question of the hon. Member my answer is a negative, and as regards the first part he will, perhaps, give me Notice of it. As regards the Question of the hon. Member for South St. Pancras (Sir Julian Goldsmid), I have to say that this subject is one which cannot be fairly dealt with within the limits of a reply to a Question. Therefore, in justice to all parties I must ask the leave of the House to refrain from answering it.

INDIA—THE DEPRECIATION OF SILVER.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he intends to lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence with the Indian Government on the subject of the depreciation of silver?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said: The Correspondence is in type, and will be presented immediately.

NAVY—ARMOUR-PIERCING BREECH-LOADING GUNS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, inasmuch as the *Edinburgh*, *Conqueror*, and *Impérieuse* are not, and never have been, in commission, there are no heavy armour-piercing breech-loading guns afloat, otherwise than in dock, except those of the *Colossus*, which the captain has been ordered not to fire?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): There are no heavy breech-loading guns afloat capable of piercing 20 inches of armour at 2,000 yards in ships in commission, except those in the *Colossus*.

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD—SMALL-POX HOSPITAL AT DARENTH.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) who had given Notice to ask the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has received protests from several Metropolitan Boards of Guardians against the proposal of the Metropolitan Asylums Board to erect a permanent small-pox hospital at Gore Farm, Darenth, at an estimated cost to the ratepayers of £116,000, which is, in the opinion of the Guardians, an unnecessary and extravagant expenditure; whether he is aware that it is proposed to hold a Conference of the Metropolitan Guardians, at an early date, to consider the question; and, whether he will withhold the assent of the Local Government Board to the proposed expenditure, at all events until this Conference has been held? said, he had now been informed that the Local Government Board had refused its assent. He wished to know if that was correct?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): Yes, Sir; quite correct.

THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES) — THE SOMERSET MAGISTRACY.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it be true that the miners of Somerset petitioned the late Lord Chancellor to commission Mr. R. Harty Dunn as a working man magistrate for the county, and whether Lord Herschell refused to commission and Lord Cork to nominate him on the ground that he is not possessed of the property qualification fixed by Law; and, whether the Government will bring in a Bill to abolish or amend the Law relating to the property qualification of county magistrates, so that, as in municipal boroughs, representative working men may be put on the Commission of the Peace?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I have inquired at the Lord Chancellor's Office and at the Crown Office, and am informed that nothing is known there of the petition of the Somerset miners, or of any papers showing what the action of Lord Herschell and Lord Cork may have been. I am unable to make any statement as to the intentions of the Government with regard to any amendment of the existing law as to the property qualification of county magistrates.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—TRIAL OF THE WALKERS (BELFAST).

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it is intended to prefer a bill of indictment against the two men Walker charged with the murder of Head Constable Gardiner at the coming winter assizes; whether it is the fact that, in the case arising out of the recent disturbance in York Street, Dublin, the Crown considered that the Orangeman charged with shooting at a Nationalist crowd would not receive a fair trial at the hands of a jury of the city of Dublin, and accordingly had the trial in the adjoining county, by a jury, eleven of whom were Protestants; whether it is the fact that in recent years the Crown, in a Kilkenny murder case (Queen v. Phelan), and in other criminal cases of an agrarian character, had the indictment transferred into the Queen's Bench, and the accused tried by Dublin special juries; whether, if the trial of the Walkers proceeds in Belfast, there is any probability (having regard to the prisoners' right of challenge) that a jury can be had which will not be to a considerable extent composed of Orangemen in sympathy with the accused; and, whether, under the circumstances, he considers the case is one in which the Queen's Bench should be moved by the Crown to change the venue?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): I fear I can give no answer beyond that given yesterday regarding the trial of the Walkers. No step to change the venue could be taken, nor could I give any effective directions as to the Winter Assizes until November; and I cannot now determine as to a course of action which must be largely dependent upon future circumstances. The Crown did not consider that the accused in the York Street shooting case would not receive a fair trial by a City of Dublin jury. He was tried in the county pursuant to a suggestion of the Court made on the occasion of an application on behalf of the prisoner for a writ of *certiorari;* but though this suggestion was made I have no reason to think that it arose from a distrust of city jurors. The murder case referred to and other country criminal cases were tried in Dublin. The venue was changed in most of these cases under the provisions of a Statute that has now expired.

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT) —SIR REDVERS BULLER.

Mr. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether General Sir Redvers Buller retains his appointment as Deputy Adjutant General, or continues to hold any military office or to draw any pay for such office?

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster) (who replied) said: As this Question specially concerns the War Office, perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer it. Sir Redvers Buller does not retain his appointment as Deputy Adjutant General; Major General Sir Edward Bulwer has already taken his place, and his appointment will be gazetted forthwith. Sir Redvers Buller does not continue to hold any military office, or to draw any pay for such office.

Mr. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.) inquired whether Sir Redvers Buller would be in military command of the troops in his district?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The officer commanding the district will take command of the troops. Prince Edward is in command of the troops in Ireland, and a General in Cork has, I believe, command of the troops in the district.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the additional part of his Question, as to whether Sir Redvers Buller was to be accompanied by a Staff; and what was the character of the force to be placed at his disposal?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I did not answer the Question because I thought the right hon. Gentleman was answered fully yesterday. After having received the assurances of right hon. Gentlemen on this Bench that Sir Redvers Buller holds a civil appointment only, I should have thought the hon. Member could hardly be in earnest in asking whether he has a Staff. He has gone to Ireland with a Secretary—a gentleman who was Secretary to the late Lord Lieutenant (the Earl of Aberdeen)—and that constitutes his Staff.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland a Question of which I have given him private Notice — Whether his attention has been directed to a paragraph in this morning's *Times* to the effect that Sir Redvers Buller was throughout yesterday engaged at the War Office with the heads of Departments arranging for the necessary force to carry out the intentions of the Government; whether Sir Redvers Buller stated to a correspondent of that paper at Euston Station that his Staff was not to be a large one; and whether he has been accompanied by a Military Secretary? I shouldl ike to know whether these statements are correct?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: My right hon. Friend is asked what occurred at the War Office. He is not able to say; but it may interest him and the House to know that Sir Redvers Buller was at the War Office yesterday for precisely five minutes, taking leave of some of his friends on leaving for Ireland, and nothing of the kind which has been referred to took place. Once again I ask right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Gentlemen to believe that when statements are made from this Bench they are made in good faith; and if apocryphal statements appear in newspapers they ought not to cause the anxiety which hon. Gentlemen seem to feel.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE — SECRET SERVICE MONEY.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Government have come to any decision upon the Report of the Public Accounts Committee of the last Session, with regard to the sum of £10,000 appropriated from the Consolidated Fund for Secret Service; and, whether they will consider the practicability of limiting the Secret Service money to annual amounts voted in Supply?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): Perhaps the House will allow me to answer this Question. I am quite aware that the hon. Member has taken a good deal of interest in this question, both in the House and on the Committee of Public Accounts, and I hope that the answer I shall give will prove satisfactory to him and the House generally. Her Majesty's Government have carefully considered the question of Secret Service money, which is appropriated out of the Consolidated Fund by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury; and the Government have decided that it would be for the advantage of the Public Service if they introduced a Bill without delay to repeal the Act 22 *Geo.* III. c. 82, or part of that Act and part of 1 & 2 *Vict.* c. 2, under the provisions of which Acts £10,000 is appropriated from the Consolidated Fund as Secret Service money to be used by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury. That Bill will be introduced by the Secretary to the Treasury, and will take effect from the day it is passed. It will, however, be necessary for the Government to present an Estimate to the House providing for the expenditure of the Government in connection with Ministerial work performed in both Houses of Parliament. That Estimate will be small and moderate, providing for a small staff of messengers and clerks. The expenses I am now alluding to will be presented and voted in Parliament in the usual way, and will consist of items which have been defrayed hitherto out of funds at the disposal of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury. I hope that the House will consider the decision of the Government a reasonable one, having regard to the official Report, and that it constitutes a beneficial reform. I may be allowed to add that any credit in the matter will be due to my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), who, from the day he came into Office last June, took great interest in this question and has greatly contributed to the course taken by the Government in the matter, and, by measures which he induced the Treasury to adopt, anticipated the Minute of the Public Accounts Committee to which the hon. Member refers.

NAVY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT— THE 43-TON GUNS.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT Rochester) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, with reference to the statement made by a late First Lord of the Admiralty on 7th May last, that the "strengthening," or supposed strengthening, of the 43-ton guns already in the Service would "in the opinion of Colonel Maitland, R.A., Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich, be completed very rapidly—in a month,"

i.e. on or about 7th June, the work was finished in that time; and, if not, when it was or will be finished; and, whether any of these guns so "strengthened" have been fired since the operation was carried out; and, if so, with what result?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): Since the statement of May 7, made by the late First Lord of the Admiralty, it has been decided to substitute for the 43-ton guns that it had been originally intended to strengthen, newer guns of an improved pattern, which were constructed for land service. Some alterations were necessary to adapt the newer pattern for the Naval Service; but it is expected that six of these guns will be mounted in the *Colossus* and *Conqueror* by the middle of October. None of the 43-ton guns that were landed from the ships have been strengthened or fired that I am aware of.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—LORD CLANRICARDE'S WOODFORD ESTATE.

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that Lord Clanricarde is meeting the tenantry on his Woodford Estate, county Galway, and that, in connection with these evictions, twenty-seven people have been arrested and imprisoned in Galway Gaol; whether it be true that, as stated in *The Times* newspaper of the 26th inst., battering rams are to be brought from Dublin in order, the more expeditiously, to level the houses of the tenantry; and, whether it is within the knowledge of the Government that the tenants on the Woodford Estate, and their predecessors in title, have built the houses and reclaimed the land from which they are in the course of being evicted; and, if so, will the Government interfere to prevent these evictions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.) was understood to say that he was unable to answer the last two paragraphs of the Question, as it only appeared in the Notice Paper that morning. But he might state that evictions were taking place on the estate of Lord Clanricarde at Woodford, and that the Sheriff's officers had been met with the most determined and organized resistance. Walls had been put up, and violent attacks were made on them with boiling water and knives. Some arrests had been made.

BULGARIA—ATTEMPTED REVOLUTION —PRINCE ALEXANDER.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which he had given him private Notice—namely, Whether he had any information as to the present whereabouts of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): I am sorry I am not able to inform my hon. Friend and the House where Prince Alexander is. All I can tell the House is that the Acting Minister at Bucharest telegraphs that the Prince had left Reni at 10 o'clock yesterday morning, and might arrive at Lemberg, in Galicia, last night or this morning. We have not heard of his arrival there.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [19th August]—[See page 96.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words,—"And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

TENANT FARMERS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM INABILITY TO PAY RENT.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): It cannot be denied, I think, that the Government, with regard to this Amendment, as well as in a general sense, occupies at this moment a position of great advantage; for whilst they enjoy the dignity and the emoluments of the Government, they are relieved, by the energy of casual allies on the other side of the Table, from the trouble either of framing a policy in the Cabinet, or of defending it in detail. I have to note, at the outset, the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), who has afforded, I think, to the House and the country a questionable example of British pluck by making his case and showing his confidence in it by running away from the reply. The right hon. Gentleman referred, last night, to the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone); but I think, Sir, considering that the Tory Party have not only taken possession of the old establishment of the late Prime Minister, but placed a couple of bailiffs on the new premises, it is not wonderful that the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister should have decided on a change of scene. I feel it necessary to explain that I am gravely misrepresented to-day in the Press, as having endeavoured to procure a restriction, from the view of Order, upon the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in the course of his speech last night. In reality, my object, Sir, as you will remember, was to remove the restriction, if possible, and to allow the right hon. Gentleman the utmost scope for his argument. The more he said the better I liked it; for I regard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham as a political misdoer, who only needs to be given sufficient material to execute the ends of public justice upon himself. The right hon Gentleman condemned the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) as being vague and inconclusive, and he did that in a speech the only reasonable conclusion of which was contrary to his action. But out of the same speech you may draw half-a-dozen contending and conflicting conclusions, according to the passage to which, at the moment, your attention may be drawn. The Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, so far from being vague and inconclusive, is definite and unmistakably clear. He says, in the first place, that he regards the prospect of the winter in Ireland with fear. There is nothing vague about fear. Fear, I think, is the strongest passion of human nature, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is, perhaps, beginning to understand; for if the Amendment were adopted the Prime Minister would be compelled to withdraw or modify his policy, or else to resign Office. My hon. Friend the Member for Cork fears that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and that they will be unable to pay those rents. He further says that—

> "Numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing wide-spread suffering, and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the tax-payers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."

That is the Amendment, clear, definite, dealing with the declared policy of the Government, addressing itself to the present condition of affairs, and warning the Government and the House of an imminent risk that stands immediately before it. That is the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham describes as an abstract proposition. He says it is not the practice of the House to entertain affirmations of that kind, unless they are prepared, at the same time, to recommend some remedy for the state of things which they fear. I say, at once, that is not a Constitutional proposition. It is the duty of private Members, who have to expound the grievances of the people, to expose the dangers to which they are exposed, and to suggest perhaps, if they can, a remedy. But if a case of grievance is proved, the responsibility rests where the power lies—with those who hold the functions and exercise the resources of the Government. My hon. Friend was not bound to provide a remedy, though I may add that, in the course of his speech, I think he did provide a remedy, which, if adopted, would be found to be quite effectual for this purpose. It would be useless and improper, the right hon. Gentleman thinks, to make an addition of this kind to the Address, unless the House were determined to deal with the subject-matter, and supply a full, complete, and satisfactory remedy. But what would follow upon the adoption of this Amendment? If the second clause of this Amendment were adopted by the House, declaring that the British taxpayers must not be plundered to give a fancy price to the Irish landlords, the Prime Minister, as I before observed, would be compelled to withdraw, or, at least, to modify, his declared and admitted policy, or else to resign his Office. If the first clause of the Amendment were carried, declaring that the Irish tenant, from causes beyond his own control, is unable to meet his rent, the noble Lord the Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill) would be compelled, upon the instant, to withdraw the incitements which he has addressed to the landlords of Ireland, and to substitute for a policy of force, a policy of remedial measures. How, then, can the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham call that an abstract proposition which, if it were adopted by the House, would compel the Government to retreat from their admitted policy upon the instant, or to resign their Office? There is no more practical, no more instant way of bringing the Government to task than that adopted by the Amendment of my hon. Friend, and right well the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham knows it. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite cheer, and, indeed, for that kind of intellectual stimulant the right hon. Member for West Birmingham yesterday had to depend upon the Opposition side. ["No, no!"] I hear the "baa" of the black sheep. Hon. Gentlemen cheer when the right hon. Gentleman declares that the Amendment of my hon. Friend puts forward an unnecessary affirmative and a gratuitous negative. Well, it used to be said in former years that the Party opposite were stupid; and, certainly, they must have preserved their historical character in cheering that sentiment, for what is the meaning of saying that the Amendment declares an unnecessary affirmative? The right hon. Gentleman did not deny its truth; and I say, if it be true, it is not only necessary, but the declaration of it is urgent, and action upon it by the Government is imperative. What does he mean by saying that, in regard to Land Purchase, the Amendment affirms a gratuitous negative? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, like a true Radical of a certain type—a rare type I am glad to say —has such great consideration for an absent person who happens to be a Lord that he debars himself from referring, in the most delicate way, to the policy with which Great Britain has been ringing in the course of the past week. The country knows that the Government, by the highest authority, stands committed to a policy of Land Purchase which must plunder the British taxpayer; because it has been told, in the most unmistakable manner, that, even if the judicial rents are found to be too high, their sacredness is not to be invaded—the landlord is not to lose. The tenant will pay the landlord for the part of the judicial rent which is found not to be too high; and with regard to the part which is found to be too high, the landlord would be paid for it by the State. How can that be said to be a gratuitous negative which opposed itself to that which was publicly declared in the face of the entire country? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham also described the Amendment as an abstract proposition. Yes, it was abstract in the eyes of the right hon. Gentleman so far only as it referred to his old friend the British taxpayer, or to the poor Irish tenants; but it becomes concrete the moment it concerns the position of the Government. "I am not going," he said—

> "To vote for any Amendment, the carrying of which would be equivalent to a Vote of Censure on the Government."

That is a simple policy; and, from the point of view of the right hon. Gentleman, it greatly economizes the need of any argument. I do not see why he should not have confined himself to that one solitary sentence. Why should he not have risen at the Table and said—

"I am not going to vote for any Amendment, the carrying of which would be equivalent to a Vote of Censure upon the Government?" Of course, if he had followed that general declaration with arguments maintaining it, the speech would have been of some value; but, in this case, the declaration of support of the Government went in one direction, and the facts of admission, without exception, went all the other way. The first observation of the right hon. Gentleman upon that part of the Amendment of my hon. Friend, which deprecates the transfer of loss to the British taxpayer in respect of Land Purchase in Ireland, was that it was an anticipatory repudiation of a policy which found no expression whatever in the Queen's Speech. But what does the right hon. Gentleman find expression of in the Queen's Speech? If we were depending for information on the Queen's Speech our minds would be a virgin page. The noble Lord the Leader of the House, in regard to the Queen's Speech, appears to have adopted a novel and extraordinary policy—the policy of suppressing the intentions of the Government in the document intended by the Constitution to be the vehicle of their expression—in order, apparently, judging by his subsequent attempt in this House, to prevent the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) from discharging his Constitutional function by criticism in reply. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham declared not only that the Land Purchase policy, which is to throw the burden of excessive payment of rent upon the British taxpayer, was not contained in the Queen's Speech, but also that the existence of it is absolutely denied. If the Land Purchase policy is absolutely denied by Members of the Government, I challenge the noble Lord to say so. Will he confirm that statement of his ally in distress? Will he absolutely deny that a policy of Land Purchase for Ireland, transferring any loss to be incurred to the British taxpayer, is not to be the future policy of the Government? Really, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the noble Lord ought to have agreed more definitely upon this matter before they came down to the House. The country has been told that to revise the judicial rents would be dishonest; that it would not only be dishonest, but extremely inexpedient; that it would not only be extremely inexpedient, but would put an end to all finality in agriculture, and would deprive Ireland of that period of calm and repose which is so necessary for the enjoyment of the blessings of Tory rule, which we all know to be an essential need. The noble Lord, himself an authority of the Government, second in rank, if he be not indeed, in his own estimation, the first, declared that the Land Act of 1881 was final. He declared, in the most solemn language, that it was a very valid and binding contract between the State, the landlords, and the tenants of Ireland. If that be so, how, then, are the judicial rents to touched until the expiration of the 15 years? And as the Prime Minister declared that there is no use in tinkering with the Irish Land Question, or doing anything except making an unlimited substitution of single for double ownership, and as the rents are too high, and must, if necessary, be reduced, in which case the landlords are not to be at any loss, of course it follows that the portion of the judicial rents which is found to be too high must be paid by the British taxpayer. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL and Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH dissented.] Will the noble Lord, or the Chief Secretary for Ireland, give the House, now, the slightest indication that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was right when he said that it was no part of the policy of the Government to transfer to the taxpayer any loss involved in the purchase of land from the landlords? But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, a Gentleman with a proper facility for mental changes, declares that he, like my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, deprecates any transfer of loss to the British taxpayer; and he adds, that he does not believe that the Government will be so foolish as to make any provision of the kind. Well, I think I have conclusively shown that they have already been so foolish; and I may add, that I should be prepared for any folly on the part of any Government which accepts the clandestine guidance of the right hon. Gentleman. Now, the right hon. Gentleman is a master of an art most useful in dialectics, but out of place in frank debate—the art of the suppression of the part of the case which does not suit his purpose. How did he describe the Amendment of my hon. Friend? He said the Amendment deprecated any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were high. The Amendment does absolutely nothing of the kind. The Amendment of my hon. Friend is perfectly consistent with State-assisted purchase, no matter what may be the level of the rents. There are two ways of making a safe bargain upon the subject of rent with regard to purchase. One is to fix the annual rent at a fair level, and then to give the ordinary number of years' purchase; and another way is, if the annual rent be too high, to fix a number of years' purchase so low as to neutralize the excess of the annual rent. Is not this what the Amendment does? Does it not deprecate any transfer of loss from the owners to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland? But the right hon. Gentleman, in his speech, denied it, and, turning to us, said—"Why do you not answer me, and prove the contrary?" Now I turn to him, and I ask why, in the language of the Amendment before him on the Table, why does he deliberately leave out, in the Amendment of my hon. Friend, the clause which was its essential point, and which gives to it its character and its meaning? Does he think that conduct of that kind would ever give him an advantage in debate in an Assembly of English Gentlemen? If he does, he will surely find out his mistake. But the right hon. Gentleman was very anxious to know if the late Prime Minister had yet abandoned the Land Purchase Bill; and the right hon. Gentleman, setting himself up as an excellent judge of honour, held that the late Prime Minister was under an obligation of honour regarding it. What obligation of honour? The late Prime Minister, recognizing a certain amount of moral responsibility, made the Irish landlords an offer the most liberal that they will ever receive. An obligation of honour! Why, Sir, if you allow a man for a certain time to possess himself of the property of another, if you support him in aggression and extortion, if at length you have to abandon that policy, and to take a course of justice and fair play, if at that moment you say to that man—"I am prepared to make you an offer, I am willing to save you, and I can make you this offer the best I can make." Well, if he refuses that offer, spurns it, and, in fact, uses it for the purpose of bringing discredit upon the person who made it, where, I say, is the obligation of honour to renew it? No, Sir; I think if there is any more talk about honour, that the late Prime Minister might say, as Lady Teazle said to Charles Surface—"Had we not better leave honour out of the question?" Certainly, whatever may occur, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian would never make the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham either the judge or the custodian of his honour. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Chamberlain) is not a very simple man, yet he gives other men very much his seniors, and who have very much the advantage of him both in intellectual ability and in experience of life, credit for more than extreme juvenile simplicity; and he wants to know from the late Prime Minister if he has abandoned his Land Bill. In reply, it will suffice to say that the late Prime Minister remembered that the right hon. Gentleman, in accordance with a very curious plan he has adopted —namely, that when seeking to defeat one measure of his opponent he expatiates and descants on the merit of another—had defeated himself (Mr. Gladstone) on the Home Rule measure by recounting and denouncing the dangers of the Land Bill. In playing the game of politics, a Member might, perhaps, be allowed to have the ace up his sleeve once, but he would not be allowed to have it there a second time. Then, as to the question of honour, I will answer that by saying that I believe the Liberal Party of the future will have in concert no concern in any scheme for plundering the tenants of Ireland. The sands in the glass are running out; and, in order to give the glass a second chance of running, it is necessary that the glass should be turned, and that, I am confident, is an act which the late Prime Minister will never be brought to perform. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham says a charge is brought against him, that he himself brought forward, in the Cabinet, a large scheme of Land Purchase, almost as extreme in principle as that of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, but more dangerous, and with less security to the British taxpayer. Sir, that is an interesting revelation. It does appear to me that his position in regard to the British taxpayer seems to be one of this nature—that whenever a Tory Government proposes to mulct the British taxpayer in the interests of the landlords, that they should be allowed to do so; but that, when he was on the Continent, a measure of Land Purchase having been brought forward by the Liberal Government, he made such measure a matter of hostile conduct, even when the measure of the late Prime Minister was perfectly safe, and involved not the slightest risk. Then the right hon. Gentleman considered such a scheme a fit measure for denunciation, because he loves the British taxpayer so well, and thinks that if any man is to take a liberty with him it must be himself. He was opposed to the scheme of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. ["Oh, oh!"] Another of the scanty flock! The right hon. Gentleman said that he had opposed the Land Purchase scheme of the late Government on the ground that it involved a risk so tremendous that it practically amounted to a certainty of loss. Now, Sir, I deliberately challenge that assertion. I say that the argument of the right hon. Gentleman, that, if the fall in the prices of produce were established, the Irish tenants would show they were not unable to pay the rent which was the basis of this scheme, was not a valid argument, because we had reason to hope, from the fact that 20 years was fixed as the maximum period in the Bill of the late Prime Minister, that the Imperial Commission were to be allowed to fix any minimum they pleased, and special provisions were made in the Bill for cases on such estates, and on those mentioned by Sir James Caird, where economical rents had disappeared, or nearly disappeared; and it was the first duty of the Commission administering the Act to fix a number of years, so that the annual instalment to be paid by the tenant should not be unduly burdensome to him. We had, therefore, good reason to hope that the measure of the late Prime Minister, if carried, would not have involved any practical risk, and would not have resulted in any loss. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had surpassed the ordinary audacity of militant debate, when he said that his contention was that the Land Scheme of the late Prime Minister was backed by the Land Revenue of Ireland and nothing else. If he has any blushes left, let him prepare to blush. The advances under the Land Purchase scheme of the late Prime Minister were backed, not only by the Land Revenue of Ireland, but by every penny of the Public Revenue. The late Prime Minister fixed the issue——

Mr. LEWIS (Londonderry): I rise to Order. ["Oh, oh!"] I wish to know whether the hon. Member is in Order in discussing upon the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork the provisions of the Land Purchase Bill of the late Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: The last paragraph of the Amendment deals with the Land Purchase scheme. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) is consequently in Order.

Mr. SEXTON: I may also point out that the alleged defect in the Land Purchase scheme of the late Government formed the reason assigned by the right hon. Gentleman for voting against this Amendment, and I am defending the Amendment. The scheme of the late Prime Minister was backed by every penny of public money of Ireland. Let us suppose the issue of the scheme amounted to £150,000,000; let it also be understood that a great part of the pastural lands were excluded from the operation of the Land Scheme; also that the Purchase Commission had power to say in any case whether the terms of sale were fair, and that the Purchase Commission had power to refuse their sanction to sell at all, and that it was within the discretion of the Imperial Commission to limit these. Suppose there was this issue, then that would involve the Government in Ireland in an annual liability of £2,000,000. Has the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, however, forgotten that the tenant, under that scheme, was to pay 20 years' purchase on the full judicial rent, and that the landlord was only to receive the same number of years' purchase on the nett rent—that is to say, the rent, after deducting from it various charges, calculated to amount to four years; so that while the tenants paid on 20 years, the landlord was to be paid upon 16 years; and the difference of four years upon the rental went, as a guarantee fund, into the hands of the Irish Treasury under the scheme of the late Prime Minister? Then, for this £2,000,000 the Irish Government would have been bound to pay to you, they were entitled to receive from the tenants £2,400,000; that was secured by the Land Bill. There was also the additional security of the Public Revenue. The right hon. Gentleman said last night it only left a few hundred thousand pounds. I hope he has not such a loose manner of managing the finances of Birmingham. The Public Revenue of Ireland amounts to £8,000,000. The charges upon it, under the scheme of the late Prime Minister, amounted to about £4,500,000, but that amount included £1,000,000 for a Constabulary Force. That Constabulary Force was to cease in a couple of years, as soon as the Irish Government could raise a suitable Native Force. [*Interruption.*] Just so; I am perfectly well aware that a Native Force would be disagreeable to the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). Therefore, the payment of £1,000,000 sterling in support of the Constabulary would cease, bringing the liability down to £3,500,000. The right hon. Gentleman suggested that the Revenue might fall. Has it ever fallen? Look back upon the records of the Irish Revenue, and you will not find that it has fallen. We take good care that it does not fall. It has been on a steady increase from year to year, sometimes to a very considerable extent. There is certainly no such thing as a falling back in my study of the record of Ireland. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman is not entitled to raise against us a plea which is not sustained by experience, and which all experience shows to the contrary. The right hon. Gentleman also made a point of the fact that the Imperial control, in the full sense of the word, was to be retained only over the Customs and Excise. But every penny of the Irish Revenue was to pass into, and through, the hands of British Imperial officials, and all the obligations to England would have had to be discharged, before a penny could have been applied to the Public Service of that country. Therefore, the right hon. Gentleman's point about the security altogether fails; for you have the absolute security of a fund of £7,000,000 a-year paid into the hands of an Imperial official, and yet the right hon. Gentleman suggests that that involves risk. If his private fortune is as well invested, he may smile at the uncertainty of finance. I think I have shown that the security is ample; but the right hon. Gentleman goes on to say that he is willing to lend to an integral portion of the Kingdom, but that he is not willing to lend to what would practically be a foreign country. Let me ask him, and let me solemnly ask the House, which looks more like the foreign country, the country which Lord Aberdeen left the other day, or the country to which Sir Redvers Buller went yesterday? Sir, I take these two instances as the types of Union and Disunion. I say, when the people of Dublin—the working men, the trades and the National League—accompanied Lord Aberdeen on his departure, and gave him, as he left their shores, their blessings and congratulations, that instance, I say, was the type of true Union. That incident was also the fruit of the policy of the late Prime Minister—a policy which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has condemned; and, Sir, if that policy could have been continued, it would have been well, for it is not by the despatch of gallant officers who have solved similar troubles in other parts of the world, that you will solve the problem of disaffection in Ireland. No, Sir, because in that case the Union between the people of this country and the people of Ireland would be a Union which the unnatural combination of intriguing politicians would not be able longer to delay, The Union that should endure cannot be a forced Union procured with manacles, but a voluntary union of hearts. Lord Aberdeen had been in Ireland, and his experience was that you must readily and must effectively meet the desires of the Irish people if they were desired to be loyal to the Throne and to be faithful to the interests of the Government; and he endeavoured to maintain the unity of the Empire by fairly considering their interests and their rights; and Lord Aberdeen witnessed a sight which he declared he could never forget. Sir, the Government's policy is to follow Lord Aberdeen with Sir Redvers Buller. The last time I saw the exploits of Sir Redvers Buller was where they were pictorially depicted. He was sitting on a camel in the Desert. There was a box on the back of the camel. He had a sword by his side as long as himself, and a telescope was placed to his eye as he looked out for Tokar. His being sent to Ireland makes it look more like a foreign country.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. Gentleman does not appear to be dealing very closely with the subject of the Amendment—the difficulty of tenants to pay their rents.

Mr. SEXTON : I was endeavouring to deal with the Land Purchase scheme, and that point in the Amendment relating to it. I shall not pursue the subject, but shall put myself right with you. I shall endeavour to point out the reason why the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is untenable. That right hon. Gentleman said he would give cordial support to any proposal the Government would make for the establishment of a peasant proprietary in Ireland, provided that the whole arrangement was under the complete and effective control of the Imperial Parliament, and carried out, as he described in his speech last night, through the intervention of and by the Municipal Authorities. Will the right hon. Gentleman tell me, and tell the House, or tell the country, now, or at any future time, had the collection of instalments for repayment of Land Purchase in Ireland been made more certain, or more safe, by being collected by the hands of the Imperial Government? I say the difficulty of collection will be greater on that account. If, on the other hand, the collections were made by the agents of the Native Government, the people, I think, would make greater, and even more painful, exertions to meet their obligations. Certainly, a plan such as that of the late Prime Minister, by which the Government would be relieved from the embarrassing necessity of going to the door of every individual tenant and collecting the tax from them, and would have the security of the good faith of the Irish Government and the whole of the Public Revenue—that would be a better system and one more secure than that of the right hon. Gentleman. The noble Lord the Leader of the House contemplates that this Commission shall inquire into the arrangements made in congested districts, in which Local Bodies will have to give security for the repayment of loans. Was there ever a more fantastic proposition? These congested districts are the very places where Sir James Caird and *The Times* say the economical rent has disappeared; but we do not go that length. It is not necessary for our argument. We only contend that the rents are too high. The noble Lord, in effect, proposed that some Local Body should be constituted, to place on the people the new burden of the defalcations of their neighbours. At any moment, upon the bankruptcy of these Local Bodies, the security of the noble Lord would disappear into thin air. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has said that he would not vote for an Amendment which, if adopted, would have the effect of a Vote of Censure upon the Government. He says he is willing to wait, and his speech was conceived in the spirit of a waiter. It is long to wait. We are, in spite of the terrible urgency of affairs in Ireland, to wait as long as the Government wish; but let me point out what must be obvious to the House, that when the Government have ceased to wish they will be a Government no longer. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, the right hon. Gentleman met our arguments concerning the fall in prices, by the statement that the enormous sums which are paid for the tenant right are an argument against our contention that the rents are too high. He said that the argument had been previously produced in the course of this debate, and in saying that I suppose he referred to the humorous speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. The hon. and gallant Gentleman is, of course, equal to every emergency. If he had lived at Rome, in the time of Nero, he would have been one to play second fiddle to Nero when the city was burning. The hon. and gallant Gentleman told the House the story of Gweedore—Gweedore, that wretched spot where the tenants by a labour worse than penal servitude have made some soil on the face of the rock, and where every year some of these tenants are thrown on the public funds. The case of Gweedore, as he stated it, was this—there are a large number of tenants paying very small rents, none of them over £4, and some of them as low as half-a-crown, and he stated two or three cases where the tenants of these wretched holdings had been able to sell them for sums as large as £100. It is true that the tenant right of some of these small holdings have been bought at a high price; but those who have paid the money are persons who had originally gone from the district—some of these persons had gone to America, or Australia, or England, or other parts of the world, and, after having by long years of labour scraped together a little fortune, they have gone back to Gweedore to spend the end of their days in the place where they were born. The hon. and gallant Gentleman will not differ from me when I say that the love of these people for their native soil, and the spot where they were born, is passionate in the extreme, and I can tell him these prices of £80 or £100 which these people gave for the strip of bog that is their native spot, is not to be taken as any test of the commercial value of the strip of bog. This passionate love for the place where these people were born, apart from the commercial aspect of the question, is the very reason why the Legislature found it necessary to interfere, the landlords having all the land in their hands, and the land being necessary for the sustenance of the people, because your policy had left them no other means of living. The landlords, in these circumstances, could always command for the tenant right a price absolutely and fabulously in excess of any value which it possessed. If the bulk of the tenants on the Gweedore estate desired to sell their tenant right, they could not do it; but, occasionally, there turns up some returned emigrant, who has some money to fall back upon, and he is willing to give a large sum for the strip of bog as a matter of affection and not of commercial value. What is the value of this splendid estate of which we have heard so much? This splendid estate on the coast of Donegal is valued by the Government official at 7*d.* an acre. That took in, of course, the good parts with the bad. Had it not been for the good parts, there could have been no valuation so high as 7*d.* an acre. If the Commissioners had been obliged to value certain parts, they would have laboured under the difficulty of finding any coin small enough to express the amount. These people formerly lived in villages, forming pastoral communities, with common rights of grazing. Captain Hill, the landlord, or rather his father, some 40 years ago, broke up the communities in the villages, put an end to the pastoral life of the people, took from them the only thing that was of any value—the common right of grazing, and, with a cruelty which would open the eyes of the British people, if they knew to what use the laws are turned in Ireland, sent these unfortunate people, without any particle of dwellings, on to the bog as it came from the hand of nature. The tenants, going on to these strips of bog, quarried stone from the granite quarries, and built houses and out-offices for themselves. They drained, fenced, and manured the bogs, turned what had been rough grazing into arable land, and the landlord raised the rent as they went on. Can the hon. and gallant Gentleman deny what I assert, that when £80 or £100 is given for the purchase of the tenant right of one of these holdings, it is given, not for the landlord's legal and equitable rights in the strip of bog, the only thing that belongs to him, but the tenant's interest in the houses, the out-offices, the fences, the drains, the reclaimed soil, and everything which give value to the strip of bog? One other fact—Captain Hill, by threats and other devices, kept the tenants out of the Land Court as long as he could. [*Cries of* "No!" *and counter cries of* "He did!"] How, and when, did they go in? He gave them to understand that, if they went into the Land Court, he would swamp them with the cost of appeals. They struggled into the Land Court, nevertheless, at last, and what became of their suffering landlord, whose case has excited the sympathy of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. What did the Sub-Commissioners take off the rents? The average reduction of rent all over Ireland is less than 20 per cent. The reduction of the rents of Captain Hill was 37 per cent. The gallant gentleman felt so outraged at this that he brought the case immediately under the notice of the Chief Commissioners, and the Chief Commissioners were themselves so much startled at this extraordinary reduction, that they departed from the usual course of official routine, and fixed a special sitting on the spot for the examination of the reduction. I here come to a fact which, if the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh was not so much an Englishman as not to know when he was beaten, he would admit that his case was pulverized. The Chief Commissioners confirmed the reduction, and the Court which gave and confirmed that reduction of the two-fifths of the rents had before them all the facts stated by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, as to the number of their holdings, the smallness of the amounts of rent, and the sums given for the tenant right. With these facts before them, the judicial tribunal appointed by this House, and responsible to the country, gave this verdict, reducing the rents by 37 per cent; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham says that we are to be patient. He says that the late Government came into Office as a Government of Inquiry, and that this Government is also a Government of Inquiry. There is inquiry and inquiry. The late Government made its inquiries of the public bodies in Ireland, and of those who were most competent to give them authentic information upon the matter in question. The late Government also followed up their inquiry by prompt and decisive action; but, Sir, the present Government intend to confine inquiry to a body of their own nominees. Nor do they intend to expedite the action or the Report of their Commission. They have told us it is not to be made before the end of next spring; and when the end of next spring comes and the Report arrives, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer declares, in advance, that that Report will require immense consideration. As an admirer of the style of the noble Lord, I am amazed at his phrases, and at a loss to know where he gets them. We cannot certainly have any decision in the shape of a legislative proposal upon the Report of the Commission of Inquiry before the end of the Session of next year. What is to happen in the meantime? The crash will come, unless something is done to confront the difficulty, and avert it during this winter. Yet the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the noble Lord would have us rely upon their Commission of Inquiry. Still, I might have had some confidence in the Commission of Inquiry, if they had been allowed to answer the questions which have been put to them. But the noble Lord has adopted a course destructive of all confidence, for he has laid certain questions before this Commission, of his own nomination, and then has proceeded himself to answer his own questions. Certainly, I should feel no confidence in the decision of a Court, if the Judge of the Court had the selection of the jury, and if, before the jury retired to deliberate, he delivered to them the verdict to which they were to come. The noble Lord says the Commissioners are to be appointed to inquire into what extent and in what parts of Ireland the operations of the Land Act is affected by a combination to resist the enforcement of legal obligations—that is to say, the payment of rent. Would it not have been more judicious on the part of the noble Lord, as a statesman, even from his own point of view, to have abstained from delivering any opinion on the question? He said that Her Majesty's Government were aware that a great and widespread organization had endeavoured, not without success, arbitrarily to control the working of that Act to their own ends. What is to be inquired into by the Commission? I know something about Ireland, and I certainly am not aware of any such organization. If the noble Lord refers to the National League, I can tell him that the policy of the National League is to assist evicted tenants. The policy of that body is to advise tenants to pay the utmost rents which they are able to pay—["Oh, oh!"]—having regard to the value of the produce of their farms. ["Oh, oh!"] Sir, there is a combination of landlords in Ireland. There is a combination by which landlords aid one another with funds and with counsel to promote and stimulate evictions, to take possession of lands from which the tenants have been evicted, and to induce the Government, if they can, to abolish the National League, so that when the tenants are thrown out upon the highways, they may not even have the resources of public benevolence, but be driven to the workhouse. But the noble Lord asks the Commission a second question. The Commission are to inquire whether there has been an exceptional fall in the price of produce. Why, Sir, we might as well have a Commission to inquire whether in Ireland, as in other parts of the world, the sun produces the daylight. What is the meaning of this Commission? The noble Lord had only to examine the file of any newspaper to ascertain that there had been an exceptional fall in prices. He had only to step into the Office of the Board of Trade to ascertain that fact, or, without going outside the circle of the Cabinet, he might have inquired of the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith), in whom the Government have great confidence. ["Hear, hear!"] Certainly, they must have; because they allowed him to turn their Irish policy topsy-turvy in 24 hours. Why did not the noble Lord inquire of the Secretary of State for War why he has taken 40 per cent off the rents of his tenants in Suffolk? The Secretary of State for War is an eminent man of business. I am sure he is not an hysterical philanthropist. He would not take 40 per cent off his rents; he would not even take off 1 per cent, unless there was good reason for it. If the noble Lord had asked the Secretary of State for War why it was that this year he had taken 40 per cent off the rents of his tenants in Suffolk, I am satisfied that the reply of the right hon. Gentleman would have proved to demonstration that it was in consequence of fall in prices. Why did not the noble Lord write to Sir James Caird? I would not ask him to write to the editor of *The Times;* because, of course, when it is a question of whether the Irish tenant can give security for the land, *The Times* sets him down as a man of straw; whereas, when it is a question of paying his rent, *The Times* describes him as a sort of bucolic Crœsus. But Sir James Caird is an eminent man, whose position is such that he could not risk his reputation by any such causeless change of opinion; and he would have been glad to have submitted to him a Memorandum of his own in March of this year, in which he went so far as to state that in the case of four-fifths of the holdings of Ireland, economical rent had disappeared. How otherwise could it have disappeared except by the fall in prices? But the noble Lord gives the Sub-Commissioners and the Land Court credit for the gift of prophecy, for he said that not only did they take into account the state of the crisis, when they fixed the judicial rent, but that they left ample scope for any fall in prices. I challenge the noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman beside him on this point. They have different functions in the House; for while the noble Lord puts spirit into the serried ranks behind him, the right hon. Gentleman instils fear into those in front of him. I would refer the noble Lord to the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahony), which has not been answered and will not be answered, because it is unswerable. What did my hon. Friend say? He was engaged in fixing rents for three years, and began in 1882. At that time the Commissioners took the prices from 1876, and there had been a period of depression from 1877 till 1881. No doubt, the Commissioners fixed rents upon the average of the low prices of these years; but what says my hon. Friend? He says that the period of depression had already lasted so long that, judging by the duration of former periods of depression, they calculated it was near its end, especially as the year 1882, in which they began to fix the rents, was an exceptionally good year. They made up their minds, so far from leaving scope for the fall in rent, that the good time had come. Will the Government inquire of the Sub-Commissioners whether that is, or is not, the case? My hon. Friend referred to the five separate articles on which the Irish farmers pay their rent when they pay it at all; and he showed, taking the average of the years on which the rent was fixed, and the prices of produce in the present year, that the prices had fallen on the different articles from 22 to 45 per cent, or an average of 25 per cent all round. What is the effect of that upon the tenant's ability to pay rent? The effect is greater by far than the nominal percentage. There is an old and general rule which gives one-third of the produce for the rent; one-third for the cost of production; and one-third for the profit of the tenant. Does the House accept the rule, or is there any rule that would better please the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the Unionist Liberals or the noble Lord? Suppose we take that rule, and say that the value of the produce of a farm was £60 when the judicial rent was fixed; let us assume also that prices have since fallen by 25 per cent, and that the Sub-Commissioners take the average prices between 1878 and 1882, and upon the average they fix the rent; but if the value of produce has fallen by 25 per cent, £15 is taken off, and where is that to come from?

If you take that £15 off the profits of the tenant, you leave him not £20, but £5. I say, in order to place the tenant this year in as good a position as he stood in when judicial rents were fixed, that the £15 should come off the landlord's rent. I must say I frankly regret the argument that if the tenant, in a bad year is to have a remission made to him, in a good year the surplus should be given to the landlord. The landlord is a person who, without doing anything for it, receives a considerable income. The tenant is a person who obtains a fair subsistence by his hard labour; and if any man tells me that when a chance of a good year comes, the tenant is not to be allowed to lay by a few pounds for sickness and old age, but that he must put these few pounds into the hands of the landlord, I say that the doctrine is revolting to humanity and civilization. What is the effect of the argument I have brought before the House? Taking the judicial rents as they were fixed, accepting the rate of one-third for rent, one-third for cost of production, and one-third for tenant's profits, and calculating upon the basis of a fall in prices of 25 per cent, I say that the tenants of Ireland, to be as well off as they were in 1882, should have their rents reduced by 75 per cent. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham endeavoured to embarrass the Irish Party by quoting the speech of an absent Gentleman in this House. He is not here, but I am here to speak for him. This speech was made as far away as Chicago, at the Convention; and the point of the reference to the speech was this—that we are determined to make trouble for the Government in Ireland; that if trouble occurs in Ireland it will be our fault; and that, in point of fact, if the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer comes down in November, as he expects to do, to propose a Coercion Bill—for that is the real point of his policy, and all the rest is kite-flying—if he comes down in November to propose a Coercion Bill, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham will support him, on the ground that they are entitled to look with suspicion upon the accounts of the inability of the tenants to pay. It may be interesting to the right hon. Gentleman to know this in connection with the Chicago Convention. He used to say, tauntingly, in words which came strangely from the lips of a Radical, that you (the English) are 30,000,000 people, and that we (the Irish) are only 5,000,000. But the Chicago Convention is one of those facts which proves to any intelligent observer that if you are 30,000,000, we are nearer 25,000,000 than 5,000,000. He challenged us to answer whether or not we adopted the language used by the hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. J. Redmond) at Chicago, when he said it would be the duty of the Irish Members to make government in Ireland impossible. Well, the first remark I have to make to that is this—if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington have their way, they will soon make the present system of English government in Ireland impossible. And that not because of the resistance of Ireland, as because of the disgust of the people of England. I must again observe that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, in quoting my hon. Friend the Member for Wexford, pursued a policy of unjustifiable reserve. Why did he sever a phrase from its context in his speech? Why did he distort and mutilate it to disguise its meaning? I shall supply the omission. My hon. Friend said—

> "The principle embodied in the Irish movement to-day is just the same principle as was embodied in every Irish movement for seven centuries. The settlement offered was one honourable alike to England and to Ireland, and such a settlement was offered to us by Mr. Gladstone."

That was the language frankly and courageously used many thousands of miles away, in the presence of the bitterest enemies of England and those who have suffered the bitterest wrongs at her hands. All those wrongs, however, were forgotten, and the feeling uppermost in the hearts of the Irish race at home and abroad was that of gratitude to the aged statesman who proposed to do us justice. Sir, Ireland was ready to forget and forgive her injuries. She was ready to sacrifice many things for the sake of peace, so long as the one essential principle of her own Senate was granted to her. She was willing, on the day when the doors of her ancient Senate House were opened, to shake hands with her relentless foe, to make peace with the nation whom the Almighty so placed that the two peoples might be friends, but who had been kept apart by avarice, injustice, and passion. [*Ministerial cries of* "No, no!"] Yes; avarice, injustice, and passion. We have given England the most convincing proof that, on the cession of liberty, we can be trusted friends. It now remains for us to prove, for the thousandth time, that as slaves we can be formidable foes. Sir, I adopt these words of my hon. Friend (Mr. J. Redmond). There is not, in the natural law, nor in the law of nations, nor in the law prevailing between England and Ireland, any obligation upon men, conscious of intellect in their minds, and consciousof men's hearts in their bosoms, tamely to accept slavery at the hands of another nation. The Constitution says we are freemen. We will exert ourselves to the uttermost of our power, as circumstances permit, to maintain the Constitution, and that declaration regards any statesman, or any man who has the position without the intellect of a statesman, who presumes to attempt to violate it. Sir, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham declared that he was satisfied with the results of the General Election. He is evidently consoling himself with that cynical beatitude which declares those to be blessed who expect nothing, and who are promised, as a reward for their lack of importance in this kingdom, a place of satisfaction in another. Sir, I cannot understand the frame of mind of the statesman who is satisfied with an Election which decimated his own Party, which, out of 70 new candidates presented by him and his Friends, returned only five.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I rise to Order. Sir, I wish to know if the hon. Member is in Order in referring to the late Election? What has that to do with the Amendment before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Member to be speaking on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, which is now before the House, and on which he is entitled to reply. I think the subject of the General Election has no bearing whatever on the Amendment before the House.

Mr. SEXTON: Sir, I shall not attempt any further to reply to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham on this subject. But, Sir, I will say, in conclusion, that we know the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and I will add that it matters very little what his policy may be. He used to be, at one time, perhaps, a somewhat influential Member of this House. Now, if he is the Leader of a Party at all, it is a Party that could be very easily accommodated in a sentry box. He is more a Tory than the Tories themselves. His policy now is to vote for nothing——

Mr. CHAPLIN: Order, order!

Mr. SEXTON: I am dealing with the Amendment. Recent occurrences seem to have given the right hon. Member for Sleaford a very unquiet mind. The policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is to vote against anything which may have the effect of a Vote of Censure on the Government. The policy of the noble Lord the Leader of the House is to draw bills upon the future, which he does not intend to honour at their maturity. His ostensible policy is an inquiry which is to bear fruit next year; but it will have no relation to the practical facts of politics when next year comes, for he will, long before that time, have brought other forces into play. He has not only assured the landlords of Ireland, but he has incited them by his address to them. Everybody knows to what purpose the Forces of the Crown will be put when they are in the hands of the Government of Ireland. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said his assurance on the point of the employment of troops was superfluous. Yes, it was superfluous; it was only meant as an assurance, but it acquired a weight from the words he had used. The noble Lord had plainly told the landlords of Ireland that they should exact the full rents this winter, because the payment of the full rents will be regarded as proof, when the scheme of Purchase comes to be considered, that the rents are not too high. Sir, we wait the result with feelings of the greatest apprehension, and I wish to say we will not be responsible for the consequences. I wish also to say, at this moment, that we are not deceived by the noble Lord or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham; we wish to say that we are convinced that this Commission on the material resources of Ireland will never come to anything. The question of the maintenance of the Constitution in Ireland, and the right of the Irish people to live in their homes, and to be relieved of the effects of an economic crisis over which they have no control, will be tested and tried by the Government. That is the ostensible policy of the Government, and the issue will be tried between the Irish people and the Government before that ostensible policy can be put to the test. Sir, our policy in the matter is clear. It is to stand as far as we can by our people. We will counsel them always to stand by one another. We will ask them not to be intimidated by any words concerning combination. The combination among the landlords must be met by combination for defence on the part of the tenants. No doubt, Sir, we shall bid them remember with gratitude and confidence the efforts of the great statesman to establish peace between Great Britain and Ireland. We shall conjure them also to remember that 1,250,000 of the voters of Great Britain have declared for them. We shall also ask them to believe that the majority against the measure of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian at the last Election was a factitious majority; that it was a majority of only 70,000 upon 2,800,000, being only one in every 40 who went to the poll. We shall point to that majority made up, and more than made up and accounted for, by the plural votes of the Tory squires in England, as a majority not of men but of votes; and that if the majority of votes was against the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, the majority of men was with him. We shall ask the people of Ireland to remember that fact. But we have hope, Sir, we do not yet abandon hope, that the Irish people, even in the midst of their struggle of the coming winter, may be able to avoid excesses and outrages. We have still some hope that the landlords of Ireland will not act harshly. If landlords like the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), who have intelligence to consider all sides of the question, think of that, they must feel some concern for the future of their country; and if they use their influence with the landlords of Ireland, we are not without hope that the evil incitements of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer may be without avail. But, whatever may happen, there is one thing we shall not do. In the presence of the indication from the Government that the payment of full rents this winter will be forced from the people, before the Commission which is to fix whether these rents can be paid or not has commenced to sit, the Irish Members will not place themselves in the position of estate bailiffs and rent collectors to the landlords of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham thought the hon. Member for Cork was bound to place himself in the position of a rent collector. He says the influence of the hon. Member for Cork has been great in the past, and it will be powerful now, if he used it to induce the tenants to pay their rents. Why, Sir, even the Leader of a Cabinet is not always able to control the passions of the limited number of persons who compose it, although, perhaps, they may have no occasion to complain, except what is given them by their own inordinate vanity and disordered imaginations. How, then, can a public Leader be expected to control a whole people? There are depths of passions, there are extremities of despair which are beyond all public control, and their methods and modes of displaying their exasperation at unjust usage are such as to get beyond the reach of any public Leader. My hon. Friend the Member for Cork, and other members of the National League —I am proud to think I also did myself —used their influence in the early part of this year to the utmost in urging people to bear their wrongs with patience. We used our influence, when we could rationally use it, at the earliest moment at which we were able, to qualify the anger, fear, and despair of the people, by showing them that there was some ground for hope. As soon as we were able to show the people that an English statesman was about to appeal to the English people for justice to Ireland, we used our influence to the fullest extent. But does anyone mean to tell me that if the Irish people are to be confronted with a policy of Sir Redvers Buller, if the policy to be applied to the Irish people by the Government is the method of dealing with savage tribes, of evictions, of refusing to recognize the ruinous fall in the price of agricultural produce, of the Government shutting their eyes to notorious evils, and refusing to recognize the wrongs under which they suffer, does anyone tell me that, in the face of facts and of a policy like that, the Irish Members are to go to the people of Ireland and say to them that they ought to strip their fields, to sell their little stock, to plunge themselves in debt for the purpose of creating an argument against themselves? If we were to do so, does the House not think that the Irish people would condemn us as cowards and fools. We will do anything that is possible in fairness and justice, on the basis of reason, to promote justice and peace between the two nations. From the bottom of our hearts we ardently desire it; but we cannot make ourselves traitors to our country, or degrade it, by asking the people of Ireland this winter to pauperize themselves in order to furnish arguments to their own ruin. There is just one thing in which I agree with the Government. I agree with them that they are not likely to fall into any error, at least in their ostensible policy, by reason of hurry or undue haste. They certainly have fallen into what, I fear, will prove to be for one Party, if not for both, a fatal error hereafter, by making the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham the Dictator of their Cabinet policy, and their Leader in debates in this House. But the Government are protected from further errors from undue hurry or haste; because, as a man who has brought himself to pauperism is protected against robbery, so the Government is protected from error hereafter by having made every possible error at the outset.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West) said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had gone over a good deal of ground, and had occupied considerable time in endeavouring to make his position clear; but he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) regretted to say, and he challenged any impartial person to contradict him, he could find no effort on the part of the hon. Gentleman, in the course of his lengthened speech, to let fall one word with the intention of appeasing the discontent which was so rife in Ireland. On the contrary, from beginning to end, the course the hon. Member had pursued was one calculated to be detrimental to the best interests of peace and order in Ireland. A great deal had been said by the hon. Member as to the manifestation of popular respect when Lord Aberdeen left Dublin, and the love which the Irish people had evinced for the last Viceroy, because of the measures promised by the late Prime Minister. But they had heard a good deal about demonstrations of that kind being got up for a particular purpose; and he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) maintained that the demonstration in question was an organized demonstration, not the spontaneous outburst of loyalty, not the expression of that steadily growing Loyal Party in whose interest we were bound to maintain law and order. In order to carry out that duty, he was glad that an officer (Sir Redvers Buller) who had done good service in Egypt had been selected, although the name of this officer recalled remembrances that must ever remain dark blots on the record of the Administration of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister.

DR. TANNER (Cork, Mid) rose to Order, and asked whether these references, for which his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) was called to Order, were permitted?

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Baronet that he must not press his illustrations too far.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: The hon. Gentleman had twitted them with the smallness of the majority of electors (70,000) by which the present Government was carried into Office at the last Election; but he had omitted to take into account the large number of unopposed returns. ["Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Baronet that the preceding speaker was called to Order for touching on this subject, and that the hon. and gallant Gentleman is now following his example.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he thought that, in fairness, such statements should not pass without reply. He was proud to consider himself as one representing a majority of the people in favour of the Union, and to be supported by many on the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Baronet that he is travelling beyond the Amendment, which has reference to the payment of rents in the ensuing winter.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, there could be no doubt that the Sub-Commissioners, in fixing judicial rents, did take into account the fluctuations of prices. The speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) on the question had simply added fuel to the fire. Everything had been said by the right hon. Gentleman which could prevent the tenants paying their rents. Neither had the right hon. Gentleman, nor the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, said or done any one thing that showed that the depreciation of rents was so great that the tenants were unable, according to the Land Act of 1881, to pay their rents. Previous speakers, also, in dealing with this point, had omitted to take into consideration that the likelihood of a fall in agricultural produce was estimated by the Commissioners before fixing the judicial rents. Hon. Members had likewise failed to recognize the high probability of a good harvest being obtained in Ireland this year, as well as an increase in the price of stock. He was able to say, from his own knowledge, that the price of stock had risen, and was rising, for both cattle and sheep that had recently come over from Ireland had fetched a higher price than obtained a short time ago. These were matters that ought to be considered in connection with a question of this magnitude and gravity; for both of the right hon. Gentlemen he had referred to had stated that the tenants could not pay their rents, and they had tried to make the Government of Ireland impossible by those who were now in authority.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.), rising to Order, asked whether it was conformable to precedent for an hon. Member (Mr. Caine) who was not a Privy Councillor nor a Member of the late Government to occupy the Front Opposition Bench?

Mr. SPEAKER motioned to the hon. and gallant Baronet to proceed.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT, resuming, said, he would ask the attention of the House to the circumstances of the distress in Ireland in the years 1846, 1847, and 1848, and the outrage and crime by which it was accompanied. It was his fate to be in Ireland at that time, assisting in the work of restoring order, and while the people of England voted enormous sums for the relief of the Famine, the law was rigorously carried out, and Ireland became tranquil. At that time, though crime had followed evictions, it did not appear, from the arrests made, that outrages were committed by the class suffering from evictions. Hon. Gentlemen from Ireland had said —"Give us a Statutory Parliament in College Green; let that be once firmly established, and everything will be peace, and rents will go up." But would that be so? He remembered being at Limerick in 1847-8, when the "Old Ireland" Party and the "Young Ireland" Party were very hostile to each other; indeed, so much so, that it became necessary to protect the latter from the violent action of the former. Indeed, he then only arrived just in the nick of time to prevent Mr. Mitchel, Mr. Martin, and their friends from suffering violence. Mr. Mitchel and many of his friends were afterwards transported for life, or terms of years. And then there was "the cabbage garden business" of Mr. Smith O'Brien, after which Ireland remained quiet, prosperous, contented, and happy for 20 years. He was all in favour of doing everything that was just and generous for Ireland; but when we had treason, cruelty, and murder going on in that country, we were bound to use the powers of the law to maintain order, and repress crime, the only way of making Ireland happy and prosperous. He was anxious that the policy of the Government should be carried out, because he believed it would do more for Ireland than the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. Nor could he help commenting on the strange circumstance that, when they proposed to do for Ireland what Irishmen had been so long asking for in the way of improving the fisheries, harbours, and arterial drainage, and carrying on other public works, they were now met by the cry that Ireland did not want anything of the kind. He did not know why land should not pay a fair rent; but that was what the hon. Members opposite objected to. They desired that it should be let at prairie value, which was not only unjust, but was an act of spoliation of the owners of land, and would be most injurious to the prosperity of the country. He believed not only that the masses of this country were in favour of maintaining the Union, as, indeed, their votes at the recent Election had proved, but that they would be more and more decidedly in favour of that course the more they came to understand the bearing of the question on their own interests. If the Union were rejected and a Statutory Parliament established in Ireland, such would be the state of things in Ireland that Irishmen would be driven over to England, not by fifties and hundreds, but by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands in search of work. They would thus glut the English labour market and depress the wages of English workmen. That was not a result that was desirable, or that the English masses could be anxious to promote, when they understood the danger to which the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian would expose them. It was because he, and those who acted with him, desired that Irishmen should be happy and prosperous, and get work in their own country, that they were determined to do all in their power to maintain the Union. That the Union had tended to promote the prosperity of Ireland was, in fact, clear from the admission of the hon. Member who had just spoken—namely, that during the existence of the Union, the Revenue of Ireland had steadily and continuously increased. To what other cause than the Union could that increase be attributed? He knew of none, and that was an additional reason for supporting the policy of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central) said, he was anxious, before the debate closed, to make a few remarks upon the Amendment and the speech of the hon. Member for Cork; but after the singularly able and effective speech of the hon. Member for Belfast (Mr. Sexton) he had some little hesitation in rising. The hon. Member's speech would make it unnecessary for him to say much which he intended to say; but, so long as Irish questions were to be dealt with in the Imperial Parliament, he thought it was the duty of every English Member who had given some attention to the subject to take part in debates of this kind. He would not follow the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) in his predictions as to what would take place in the course of the autumn in Ireland in consequence of the refusal of Parliament to meet the demands of the Irish Members. He should always feel very great hesitation in expressing his views as to what would take place in Ireland if Parliament finally refused the demands of the Irish people, lest he should appear by anticipation to sanction courses which it would be his duty to deprecate and condemn. He was also exceedingly anxious to avoid saying or doing anything which might seem to embarrass the Government and add to the difficulties of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He appreciated to the full the difficulties which the Government would have to meet in Ireland and in that House. They had adopted a policy which he believed to be impossible. He believed that they would not be able to carry out the policy which they had proclaimed; but he was unwilling to do anything to increase their difficulties. He said so himself in good faith. There were many instances and illustrations in the history of Ireland in which the demands of the Irish people had been refused by the English Parliament and the English Government, which demands had later on been conceded in answer to agitation and disorder almost amounting to rebellion. The history of Ireland during the last 85 years was full of instances of that character, and they might perhaps judge of the future by the past. He felt sure that the Irish Members and the Irish people would recollect that the present position was very different from any in the past in relation to this subject. The Irish Members did not now stand alone; they had on their side the great majority of the Liberal Party of England, and only a few less than a majority of the electors of England. They might also recollect that they had also on their side the greatest, most powerful Minister of modern times, who had sacrificed himself and his Government on their behalf. Remembering this, he thought it would be very unfortunate if anything should occur in Ireland which would make the task which the Liberal Party in this country experienced—and still had before them—in carrying out the programme of justice to which they had given their adhesion a more difficult one than it need be. He was quite sure that Irish Members would appreciate this, and he was glad to observe that the hon. Member for Cork did fully appreciate it in the speech which he made a night or two ago. Some hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House saw in the speech of the hon. Member for Cork an indication of disorder which they seemed to think that the hon. Member approved of. He must say that he had listened to that speech, and had interpreted it in a totally different sense. His belief was that the hon. Member for Cork had deprecated that which he believed might possibly occur, and that he was fully alive to the very great difficulties which disorder and outrage might bring to his policy if they occurred during the coming months in Ireland. He would point out that nobody denounced outrage more than O'Connell did. O'Connell expressed his opinion that outrages were most detrimental to the cause which he had at heart; but, at the same time, he was unable, with all his great influence, to prevent occurrences which he disapproved of, and which did harm to his cause. They must not, therefore, be surprised if things occurred in Ireland which the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends disapproved of, and which would be detrimental to their interests. He would remind the Leaders of the Irish Party that the field of argument on the Irish Question had not yet been exhausted—it was not yet at an end, it was at its very beginning — and he and others on that side of the House still entertained confident hopes that the Party with which they were associated would be able to persuade the people of England of the justice of the cause which they had undertaken. Already many of the difficulties which had stood in the way of the Liberal Party at the last General Election had been removed, and others were in course of removal. He believed the greatest difficulty which they had met with was the Land Purchase Bill. His belief was that apart from the Land Purchase Bill the Liberal Party would have carried the Local Government Bill. He was sure that the Local Government Question was handicapped.

Mr. YERBURGH (Chester): Sir, I rise to Order. I wish to know whether the right hon. Gentleman is keeping himself to the Amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: I see no cause yet to interfere.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the subject to which he was alluding was included in the Amendment. He repeated that one of the difficulties which they met with at the last Election was the difficulty raised by the Land Purchase Bill. That measure might or might not be necessary; but, at all events, it was unpopular, and it enabled their opponents to raise every possible subject of prejudice against it, and exaggerate it into something of the greatest magnitude. No one was more willing to do this than the Leaders of the so-called Liberal Unionist Party. His right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham was one of those who most freely made use of this prejudice against the Bill. The difficulty raised by that Bill had now been removed out of their way, because they found that the present Government was prepared to propose a measure at least as large if not larger than the Land Bill of the late Government. The criticisms of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham would not have had the same effect in the country if he had been candid enough to say during the General Election what he said in the debate on Thursday night—that he was himself in favour of a large scheme of Land Purchase for Ireland, and also in favour of the gradual substitution of peasant proprietors for the present dual ownership of land in Ireland. Such a scheme as that would practically involve the purchase of all the rights of the landlords in respect of the tenant holdings in Ireland; and therefore the present policy of the Government practically involved a scheme of Land Purchase larger by far than that of the late Government. He thought it would only have been fair and candid on the part of his right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham if he had given to the country during the last Election his opinions upon this subject. If he had told the country, at the time he was denouncing the Bill of the late Government, that he was himself favourable to a large scheme of Land Purchase, he believed that the main force of his right hon. Friend's argument against the Home Rule Bill would have been lost, and that there would have been much greater success for the Home Rule policy. His right hon. Friend, however, was not prepared to tell the country his views at the last Election, and concealed his opinions. His right hon. Friend had told them that there were Members of the Liberal Party who were endeavouring to ostracize him and to oust him from the Party. He must say that he was not aware that any Members of the Party entertained such a wish. They all had too high an opinion of the right hon. Gentleman's talent and capacity to wish him to be otherwise than a Member of the Liberal Party. His right hon. Friend had wandered from the great majority of the Liberal Party, and this by his own wish and course rather than by any wish of the Liberal Party. During the General Election he had said many things which had given his former friends great pain. He referred especially to the attempts he had made to raise the religious question in a way——

Mr. SPEAKER: The general action of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham at the General Election has no reference to the subject of the Amendment.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he accepted the ruling of the Chair. He felt that if the country had been aware that the late Conservative Opposition and his right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham were in favour of a large scheme of Land Purchase, much of the difficulty the Liberals met with in the recent campaign would have been avoided; and it was his confident belief that a very much larger number of the electors would have given their favour to the Irish policy of the late Government, and they might even have been returned with a majority. For his part, he was opposed to any gigantic scheme of Land Purchase, such as the one proposed by the Government, whether connected with Home Rule or not. But if connected with Home Rule, such a measure would be infinitely preferable to the other, inasmuch as autonomy would give content to Ireland; whereas unconnected with Home Rule the only effect of it would be to substitute an alien Government for the landlords in relation to the tenants. At the same time, while opposed to any scheme involving the purchase of all the land of Ireland and the expropriation of the landlords, he should not object to a moderate scheme which would assist the landlords to some extent, as was proposed by the late Government, provided the sum advanced was carefully limited in amount to some £40,000,000 or £50,000,000. But anything like a general expropriation of the landlords, which was apparently aimed at by the present Government, he considered to be dangerous and inexpedient. Unfortunately, the immediate crisis was not merely a political one—it was also an economic one. It was not seriously denied in any quarter that the great fall of prices of agricultural produce, especially so far as Ireland was concerned, in the last two years had most seriously affected the condition of the Irish tenants. There was one point connected with this to which he would specially call attention, as it had not yet been noticed. He alluded to the condition of the cottier tenants in the West and South of Ireland. This class was not directly affected by the fall of prices, for they consumed almost all that they produced; they were not, strictly speaking, farmers—they were labourers cultivating small plots of land for their own food, and finding employment in England or Scotland during three or four months of the year, and they returned carrying with them £10 to £15, out of which they hoped to pay their rents and help to provide a livelihood during the remainder of the year. The agricultural depression in England had affected these people in this way—that the market for their labour had failed them, and that they were without employment, and, as a consequence, a large body of these small tenants in Ireland during the last two or three years had been thrown on their beam-ends, and were totally unable to pay their rents. Everyone would admit that their case was one calling for grave consideration. He asked the Government and the House seriously to consider the position of this class of people. Was it right that in consequence of circumstances over which they had no control, and which had deprived them altogether of the means of paying their way—was it right that they should be subjected to ejectment from their holdings? He said it would not be right. It seemed to him that, looking to the unexpected nature of the calamity which had fallen on these men, their condition deserved the most serious consideration of the Government, and something ought to be devised to save them from general eviction. He recollected when the Land Act of 1881 was under consideration suggesting to the late Mr. W. E. Forster that a clause should be introduced into it similar to the provision to be found in the jurisprudence of many foreign countries, giving to the Courts of Law power to suspend evictions in the case of the very small tenants upon equitable terms in the event of any unforeseen calamity occurring rendering them unable to pay rent; but the Government was unwilling to raise the question, and his right hon. Friend said that when such a difficulty should occur Parliament must deal with it at the time. It was his belief that this question must now be dealt with if we were not to have disorder in the districts he referred to. When they came to the case of other tenants, of those who were strictly speaking farmers, living only by the land, the case was different. He was glad to find himself in agreement with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham on this point. If it were the fact that since the fixing of the main body of the judicial rents prices had fallen from 20 to 30 per cent, and if the fall was likely to be a permanent one, then it was clear that a strong case existed for consideration. It was said that the Commissioners must have taken into account the possibilities of a fall. He presumed they went upon some plan of average prices in the past; but the subsequent fall had been, he believed, altogether beyond any experience in the past. The Government, however, had already admitted that there was a *primâ facie* case for inquiry. He would frankly admit that the subject was a difficult and a delicate one; it must be entered upon with consideration to both parties. What he wished to urge upon the Government was the extreme importance of coming to an early decision upon this subject. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) had said that he hoped the Commission would report at the end of next spring; but he would ask whether it was really necessary that there should be this long interval? The subject, though a difficult one to decide upon, was not one involving a long inquiry. He ventured to think that a Royal Commission sitting for a month in Dublin, after examining the Land Commissioners and ascertaining from them the general basis of their decisions, and after taking the evidence of competent persons upon the actual present prices of produce and the prospects of the future, might easily come to an early Report on this part of the case before the winter set in, and before proceedings became necessary for the collection of the November rents. He desired to emphasize what had been said by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). That right hon. Gentleman had said that the appointment of the proposed Commission would raise great difficulties between landlords and tenants with regard to the November rents, inasmuch as the landlords would be unwilling to make an immediate reduction for fear of prejudicing their case before the Commission. He might have added that the tenants would probably be unwilling to pay their rents for the very same reason. There would, therefore, be difficulties on both sides, which, unless they were dealt with at an early date, would probably be increased, rather than diminished, by the appointment of a Royal Commission. It was urgently necessary in the interests of both that the question, having been raised and being admitted as one proper for inquiry, should be set at rest as soon as possible. There could be no reason why the inquiry should be a long one. On this point the Commission might make an early Report. If their Report should involve legislation the responsibility would rest upon the Government for legislating at the earliest opportunity. In any case, the Report would have an important effect upon voluntary arrangements between landlords and tenants. If disorder was to be avoided in Ireland during the coming winter, he felt sure it could only be prevented by producing this Report, and, if possible, legislating in accordance with it. He would, therefore, urge upon the Government the immediate appointment of the Commission, and the promise that they should report on this branch of the subject before the winter set in. If they did not, he should have himself the gravest alarm as to what might happen. If the Government would not give any undertaking on their part, he should feel it his duty to enter a protest by voting with the hon. Member for Cork. He would not on this occasion enter upon any defence of the Land Act of 1881. He would merely point out that whatever method of dealing with the Land Question had then been adopted the subsequent fall of prices would have equally interfered with its successful working; if a universal system of peasant proprietors had been carried out by means of State loans there would now be the same outcry against the interest payable to the State as against the rents. The Land Act did not create a system of dual ownership—it only gave legal sanction and security to a system which in fact existed, and under which the tenants had acquired an interest in their holdings, which, under the then state of the law, was liable to be confiscated. The danger of dual ownerships of land in Ireland was not an economic one, but a political one; and, in his opinion, so long as England refused the demand of the Irish for self-government, so long would the landlords be connected in the minds of the people with that refusal, and would be considered as the impediments to Home Rule. The bad relations of landlord and tenant and every other bad symptom in Ireland were all intimately connected with the question of self-government. They might drive disaffection below the surface by sending a General to act the part of a policeman. They might bribe the tenants into becoming owners by extravagant terms of State loans; they might sweeten the pill of refusal by such treacle as money for material improvements; but they would have done little or nothing to establish the social system of Ireland on a sure and stable basis until they had recognized that its people were the best judges of what they wanted, and the only persons to whom the maintenance of order could be properly trusted.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) said, fault had been found with the Government on the ground of delay; but, in his opinion, what they asked for was most reasonable, looking at the unfortunate condition of things that prevailed in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had made very large assumptions with regard to what he believed to be the policy of the Government. The landlords of Ireland did not wish to appear before the country as beggars, and they did not wish to throw any increased taxation on England. They were very well contented to remain in the position they occupied, provided they were left in secure occupation of the rights which were supposed to be guaranteed to them by recent legislation. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had said that the result of the late Election was largely affected by the Land Purchase Scheme of the late Government; but they should recollect that that scheme was repudiated, not only by hon. Members opposite, but by many hon. Gentlemen who sought to get seats in the House, and who failed. He thought, therefore, that the argument that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and his followers were defeated in consequence of the Land Bill could not be sustained. The right hon. Member for Bradford had referred to the cottier tenants of the West of Ireland. He presumed he referred to the small tenants, who were under, say, £5 valuation. A large number of those came over to England every year for the purpose of being engaged as agricultural labourers—for the purpose of supplementing their means of livelihood; and, no doubt, they earned a considerable portion of their rents in that way. He had not seen, however, that the migration of those tenants from the West of Ireland to the agricultural districts of England had been less this year than usual; and, therefore, the argument that they could not pay their rent in consequence would not hold good. He was not aware of any circumstances in England that prevented them from earning the usual amount of wages they took back to Ireland. It was to be regretted, of course, that the tenants should be obliged to have recourse to these extraneous exertions in order to be able to pay their rent; but that was a difficulty —and it had been admitted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian—over which the best of Irish landlords really had no control. ["Hear, hear!"] The remedy, and he believed the only remedy, to be applied to Ireland was emigration. That idea was at one time entertained by even the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his followers. It was proposed to obtain from the State very large assistance for the purpose of migrating. It was an exaggeration to describe the landlords in the way they had been by the Nationalists. The speech of the hon. Member for Cork was throughout an echo of the Chicago Convention. The hon. Member for Cork and his followers were determined to reject the measures the Government proposed to take, and which he believed were, in the opinion of the country, best calculated to advance the interests of the Irish farmers and of all classes in Ireland. The tenour of the speeches of those hon. Members had been the inability of tenants all over Ireland to pay their rents, and the assumed determination of their landlords to extort the last penny. He denied that the Irish landlords, as a body, would do anything of the sort; but, at the same time, so much bitterness had been introduced into the relations between landlord and tenant in a large proportion of the country that he admitted that it was almost hopeless to expect a restoration of the amicable relations which formerly existed between them. No language had fallen, either from the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) in that House, or from the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) in "another place," upon which could be based any charge of inciting the Irish landlords to act harshly in obtaining payment of rent. The truth was that the policy now taken up by the hon. Member for Cork and his adherents was not so much for the protection of the interests of the tenants in Ireland, as in systematic furtherance of aims, which, at one time or another, had been avowed by Members of the Party. Speaking at Boston in 1881, Mr. Healy said that they believed that landlordism was the prop of English rule in Ireland, and they worked to get rid of it. He went on to draw a comparison between the temptation of our Saviour and the presence of the English in Ireland, and said that the Irish, when shown all the Kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, instead of saying "Begone Satan," cried out "Begone Saxon." As to the prices of agricultural produce, statistics showed that prices in 1885 were almost exactly the same as they were in 1879, and the Commissioners must have had the latter before them when they fixed the judicial rents. He did not deny that the Parnellite Party represented the greater part of Ireland, but they did not represent it all; and he knew that in his district, though the farmers complained of the depression, they looked to a different source for a remedy. They looked to some protection from foreign competition. The system advocated by the hon. Member for Cork of a triennial settlement of rents would lead to more confusion than existed at the present time in the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland, and would be extremely disastrous to the agricultural interests of that country at large. He had, from long experience and observation, become perfectly acquainted with the character of the Irish landlords as a class, and was well assured that, unless there were a combination not to pay rent, they would not resort, except at the last extremity, to eviction. It would, undoubtedly, be to himself and those hon. Members from Ireland on the same side of the House a sincere pleasure if, either by the inquiries the Government were about to make, or in consequence of any suggestions which might be made from any quarter of the House in answer to those inquiries, the period of distress, pressure, and strain which had been placed on the relations between the landlords and tenants of Ireland should be removed. The question of the Irish Land Laws was a very difficult and complex one, and he was not prepared to say that it was easy at this moment to know exactly in what direction to proceed; but he believed that proceeding in the direction of a gradual and cautious development of the Land Purchase Act passed last year afforded the safest solution.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorgan, Rhondda) said, it was not his intention to have spoken in the debate if it had not been for some words which had fallen from one or two of the speakers that evening. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) deprecated any attempt to transfer the loss on rents from the owners of the land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland. A more unsound and dangerous policy than that propounded by the Government it was difficult to understand or conceive, because it proposed to transfer the losses of the Irish landlords to the State, than which nothing could be more utterly unfair. If it was a wise policy to make good the losses of Irish landlords, why should not the losses of English, Scotch, and Welsh landlords also be made good by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom? Whatever might be the condition of the Irish tenant farmers, one thing he could say was that the position of the Welsh tenant farmer was bad enough. From his own personal knowledge of the hilly portion of Wales—and the hilly portion was the largest—the tenant farmers would be unable to pay their rents during the coming winter, not owing to their own fault, but owing to the reduced value of the farms. If it was quite fair to make good the losses sustained by landlords in agricultural enterprizes, why not make good the losses in connection with commercial and industrial undertakings? Surely what would be fair in one case would be equally fair in the other. Land in England and Wales was undergoing a similar depreciation to what it was undergoing in Ireland. It was not impossible that the land might recover its former value, or, it might be, that the returns from land might still further continue to be a languishing quantity. Therefore, the landlords ought to bear their losses in the same way that the ironmaster, the manufacturer, the colliery owner, and every suffering interest had to bear theirs. Many thousands of the working classes in this country at the present moment were famishing; and if the policy of the Government were to be carried out, there were toiling millions in this country who would have to bear the cost of such a policy. He was sorry to see that the policy of the Prime Minister in regard to this great subject had found the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork deprecated any attempt of this kind. Yet the right hon. Gentleman was going to give the policy of the Government a fair and favourable consideration. Nay, what was more, he was going to vote for the ridiculous proposals of the Government. When the supporters of the Government and those who were acting with the right hon. Gentleman combined, they could, of course, carry any proposal, for in the present Parliament it was useless to appeal to any Party to defeat them. He (Mr. Abraham) most sincerely and solemnly, on behalf of his constituents, and on behalf of thousands of Welsh working men, wished to enter his humble protest against any attempt to transfer from the landlords their losses to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland; and he also ventured to caution the Government against making any attempt in that direction, or else they would have reason to regret their dangerous proposal.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's) said, the answer to the previous speaker's question, "Why should not the same rule as to making up the losses of the landlords be applied to England, Scotland, and Wales, as well as to Ireland?" was simple enough. The landlords of the United Kingdom had made no request for anything of the kind; and the landlords of the United Kingdom had not had their rents judicially guaranteed. It was rather a singular thing to find the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) posing as the friend of the British taxpayer. The hon. Member had never hesitated to sacrifice the interests of the British taxpayer when the interest of Ireland demanded it. The attitude of the hon. Member for Cork in this matter was highly interesting. For the first time, he evinced a tender solicitude for the British taxpayer, and the House might be pardoned for doubting the purity of the hon. Member's motives, seeing that, as first lieutenant to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), he had advocated the Land Purchase Bill of that right hon. Gentleman, which would have sacrificed the interests of the British taxpayer to the extent of £150,000,000. Of the many startling changes which had taken place within the last six months this was one of the most startling. The basis of the proposal for ignoring the judicial rent fixed under the Land Act of 1881 was the alleged inability of the tenant to pay, owing to the fall in the prices of agricultural produce; but it seemed to him that the premiss had not been conclusively proved. There had been no evidence to show that the fall in the price of oats, butter, and live stock was likely to be permanent. Indeed, the Reports showed that the prices of live stock were recovering. ["Oh, oh!"] There was, however, no evidence of such a fall in the prices of agricultural produce as would justify the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork; and, on the other hand, there was ample evidence that many tenants were paying their rent surreptitiously. The policy which the Government had shadowed forth was the policy of the Land Act of 1881, supplemented by the Arrears Act of 1882 and the Purchase Act of 1885. The basis of the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork was to ignore the judicial rents of 1881 on the ground that the tenants were unable to pay. He did not think that it had been proved in the course of the debate that that was the case, while, on the other hand, there was much evidence to the contrary effect. It was a very extraordinary thing that the hon. Member for Cork asked the House, in the interests of the British taxpayer, to depart from a policy inaugurated by the English statesman whom he held in the greatest favour. He thought the faint doubts he had expressed as to the purity of the hon. Member for Cork were considerably increased when they recollected these facts; and they were justified in other ways to doubt the sincerity of the attitude of that hon. Member and his followers. Was this Amendment a *bonâ fide* attempt to bring about a better state of things in Ireland? The hon. Member for Cork and his followers came to that House unallied to any Party—they came as Irish patriots—and by the verdict of the constituencies a Home Rule Parliament in College Green had been denied them. [*Cries of* "No!"] He appealed to the facts of the results of the General Election and the present constitution of the House. The Imperial Parliament must, therefore, take the Land Question in hand, for it could not be settled by an Irish Parliament in Dublin. Under these circumstances, what good would the Amendment do the Irish-American Party, suggesting, as it did, that the policy of the Land Act of 1881 should be interfered with before the present Government had prosecuted their inquiries upon the subject? As an independent Conservative, he asked the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) and his followers if they really desired justice for Ireland, or was it not rather the fact that by supporting the Amendment they declined to be conciliated except by a grant of independence, which was beyond the power of the present House to grant? There were, he took it, three courses open on the question of land, if they admitted, for the sake of argument, that the tenants in Ireland could not pay the judicial rent. The first course was that the landlords should proceed to evict when they could not get their rent, and that the Government should not interfere; the second course was to ignore the Land Act of 1881 and to lower the judicial rents; and the third course was that the policy shadowed forth by Her Majesty's Government should be caried out—namely, that in cases where the tenants were really unable to pay these judicial rents some form of State-aided payment should be proposed, by which these tenants would be able to pay their rents and the landlords receive that to which they were entitled by recent legislation. As to the first course, he took it that it was not proposed by the Government in all its nakedness; but he might remark that it was a very curious thing that Ireland should be the only part of the United Kingdom in which men should be allowed to break through their legal obligations with impunity, and where contracts were to be looked upon as piecrusts, made only to be broken. It seemed the second course involved the British taxpayers in more of that responsibility which the Land Act imposed upon them. That was a point which was very seldom mentioned. The Liberal Government and Parliament of 1880 passed the legislation by which the judicial rents were fixed, and that imposed a responsibility on the British taxpayers. The latter were, to a certain extent, responsible for the acts of that Government, and for the legislation which was the outcome of their policy, for by their Representatives they entered into a contract between landlords and tenants. Parliament, after passing such legislation, could not, except with very good reason, interfere with it again in the way suggested. Coming, therefore, to the last alternative, they did not yet know whether the British taxpayers would be burdened at all; but if they were they had the guarantee that it was not to bolster up a foreign country and to pay rents to alien landlords; but it was done on good security, on sound conditions, and to support the industry of an integral part of the United Kingdom. He opposed the Amendment because it was open to suspicion, because it suggested an unbusiness-like policy, and because it was decidedly premature.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) said, it was evident that many of the arguments addressed to the House founded on the sacred right of contract and on the faith of Britain ceased to have very much weight with anyone coming from the North of Ireland and representing the tenants there. They had never approved of the Act of 1860, by which Parliament, for the first time, made the relation between landlord and tenant one of contract. From that period they might date the commencement of the land agitation in Ireland in its acute form. There was one matter touched upon by the hon. Member for Rhondda (Mr. William Abraham) and the hon. Member for St. Helen's (Mr. Seton-Karr), which had been used as dexterously in Ireland for the purpose of preventing Ulster tenants having fair play as it had been used in that House for the purpose of persuading hon. Members that the existence of the tenant right was an argument in favour of keeping up high rents in Ulster. They were constantly told that they ought not to seek to reduce rent in Ulster because a tenant right had been sold for 20 or 25 years' purchase. He wished to point out that the Land Commission had not only not taken into view future depression, but had absolutely refused to hear the tenants' advocates upon this subject. The very interest of the tenants of Ulster, which it was the intention of Parliament to protect, was used as an instrument to keep up the rack rent; but he could assure the Government that the tenants in Ulster would never agree to have their tenant right taken away. It could not fairly be urged that the present rent, which had been fixed without regard to future depression, should be maintained, because the result of such maintenance would be universal bankruptcy in Ulster. There was a consensus of agricultural opinion that the continuance of judicial rents was utterly impossible. Oats were the corn crop of Ulster, and Ireland produced one-third of the whole crop of the United Kingdom. As a grower, he knew that the price had fallen fully one-fourth. A shilling a stone used to be considered the retail price, and now it was 8*d.* He had sold a growing crop for less than £7 an Irish acre, and for the like crop he had formerly received £10 to £11. Twenty-five per cent was not the limit to which the price of inferior cattle had fallen; some descriptions had fallen as much as 50 per cent. A fall of one-fourth in the price of produce ought to involve a reduction of fully one-half in the rent. It was quite a fallacy to suppose that a fall in prices was represented by an equal reduction in rent. That would transfer the burden to the tenant, instead of dividing it with the landlord. The 13th section of the 3rd clause of the Land Act of 1881 did not afford to tenants under non-judicial rents any remedy against evictions. The statement that it did would not be made in Ireland when the facts were known. The costs of applications to the Courts amounted to a large proportion of the rent due, and most of the few applicants had been refused any delay, unless landlords or their solicitors would consent, and unless they would impoverish themselves to an extent which would prevent them going on at all. He would suggest a remedy for the immediate future, and the principle of it was to be found in the suggestions which had been made from the Government Bench as to the suspension of evictions. It had been pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) that certain tenants could have evictions suspended pending the consideration and reductions which were sought for by applying to the Court. He would develop that, and make it possible to prevent and defeat ejectments if the landlord refused a reasonable offer —say, two-thirds of the rent. He had heard it stated that reductions would be universal, and that the spirit of the landlords was to smooth matters over. He would leave it to the landlord to proceed under civil bill in the ordinary way for the remaining third, and allow the Court to decide whether, under the circumstances, it would allow a decree. He had himself considerable experience of the Courts in the North of Ulster, and he could say there never was a period when the disposition of the people was greater than it was now to put an end to the long struggle.

MR. F. S. POWELL (Wigan) said, the hon. Member for North Donegal who had just sat down (Mr. O'Doherty) had not wasted the time of the House; and he and others who had addressed the House from the Irish Benches left on his (Mr. Powell's) mind the conviction that this Amendment would not meet the case, but that what was required was further inquiry and deeper investigation. He regretted that reference had been made to the Chicago Convention. He condemned the strong language which had been used at that Convention, and feared that if outrages were to occur in Ireland the warmth of the present relations between England and America might somewhat diminish. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had mentioned that when he was a boy there were disturbances in Lancashire. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I was at school there.] No doubt the right hon. Gentleman was devoting himself so closely to his historical studies that he had not inquired very closely into the disturbances. Speaking from personal knowledge, he asserted that any disturbance which occurred in Lancashire had no connection with the repeal of the Corn Laws. It had been stated again and again by those who took a leading part in that movement, and by no one more emphatically than the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), that the repeal of the Corn Laws was a peaceful movement, and that no outrages took place from the beginning of the discussions to the end. No population in the world had suffered so severely as that of Lancashire did from the Cotton Famine. But there was no disturbance during that crisis. There was peace and order, and he might say even contentment, and perhaps happiness. The people of Lancashire passed through that crisis, if not without anxiety as regarded the welfare of the people, without a moment's alarm as to disturbance. What was the result of that action on the minds of the people of the country at large? When it was proposed to confer the borough franchise it was argued that the people who could behave in that way and show so much self-restraint were worthy of possessing the suffrage. It was clear, therefore, that no disturbance was necessary, in this country at least, to accomplish a wholesome reformation. The next point referred to by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) in his Amendment was the objection made to the transfer of loss from the owners of land by any extension of State-assisted purchase. Some anxiety had been expressed as to whether the English taxpayer would be saddled with an additional burden arising from grants of Imperial money to Irish landlords. It was necessary, therefore, for Conservative Members to make their position on that point clear and distinct. In the earlier portion of the year he opposed the proposal of the late Government for the purchase of land, because he was convinced, after full investigation, that the security was not a valid one, and that, in the end, great loss would be incurred by English taxpayers. But in this case, so far as he could gather from the declarations of the Government, it was no part of their plan that there should be a farthing of loss to the British taxpayer. It was upon that conviction that he and his hon. Friends from Lancashire would give support to the Government in the proposals which they had foreshadowed. Hon. Members from Ireland had a great deal to say about Irish poverty. He regretted that those declarations of poverty should be made, because they were a great weakening of the power of Ireland. It was manifest that a nation which was in the poor condition which hon. Members represented could not be in the enjoyment of credit. Ireland wanted more ample resources and larger means, in order that by taking advantage of them capital might remain in the country, be made to increase, and attracted to it. If Ireland was to take its place among the nations of the world—to use the phrase of hon. Gentlemen opposite—if it was to have a place in the industrial and commercial communities of civilization, there must be more wealth introduced in the country. The declarations of want of means, therefore, were an injury to Ireland; they impaired confidence, and were calculated to impair the resources of that country. They also heard a great deal about the wealth of Irish landlords. But talk of that kind was not justified by the facts. In reality, so far as his observation went, the bulk of Irish landlords were poor. He should like to see among Irish tenants, not only the ability and the willingness to pay their rents, but a willingness to work with a will and with skill. He was by no means convinced, from what he had seen of Ireland, and from what he had read in connection with the condition of the country, that the very best was made of the agricultural resources of that country. If the minds of the agricultural population were withdrawn from political controversy and more firmly fixed on the cultivation of the land, he believed that there would be more prosperity, greater wealth, and more happiness in Ireland. He hoped they would soon have tranquillity and order in Ireland, and that the intellectual force of the Government and the mental and physical energies of the House of Commons would be directed to a solution of the problem unimpaired by the heat of bitter controversy, and uninterrupted by manifestations of hostile feeling towards a country which was most desirous of serving Ireland.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said, he was desirous of expressing his sympathy with the cause of Ireland. He regretted that the question had led to a division in the Liberal ranks, and that the landmarks of the Party had been broken up. So far from regarding the dissentient section of the Party as Unionists, he thought they ought to be called Confusionists, who would find themselves in a very peculiar position whenever they had to return to the constituencies for re-election. With regard to the Amendment, he submitted that the depression in prices, which was patent to the whole world, was likely to be permanent. They could not exaggerate too much the facilities which were given in the present day by the telegraph and the various lines of steamers and otherwise for the carrying of produce from one country to another. As 100 tons of produce could be carried for 1*d.* per mile by sea, exclusive of handling expenses, the House could easily imagine what effect such rates must have in the bringing of produce from abroad. From the River Plate, as well as from New Zealand, we were receiving a large quantity of mutton, which was one of the staple articles of produce in Ireland. He would give a few statistics, just to show what had been the progress and increase of the shipment of frozen meat to this country. In 1882 the quantity imported was, in round numbers, 189,000 cwt.; in 1883, 286,000 cwt.; in 1884, 503,000 cwt.; and in 1885, 572,000 cwt. Those figures represented an increase in value from £637,000 in 1882 to £1,486,000 last year. Those facts were taken from the Board of Trade Returns, and could not be challenged; and he found from the Report of July that we were now receiving also considerable shipments of frozen mutton from the Falkland Islands. He learned from friends interested in the shipping trade that arrangements were being made on most of the chief lines of steamers now running to mutton-producing countries for frozen compartments to be provided, in order to bring mutton to England from all parts of the world; and he found there were now in this country 26,000 carcases at the Victoria Docks and 20,000 at the West India Docks, making a total of 46,000 carcases at the present moment in London. Of course, this supply was likely to increase, and he hoped landlords opposite would take such facts into consideration before attempting to evict their Irish tenantry at a time of unusual depression. He thought all who had studied this question must be heartily sick of the application of coercion, which had been perfectly useless and provocative of crime. The fatal sisterhood of coercion, eviction, and outrage had followed upon one another's heels. Coercion could not be applied to the Irish people without arousing feeling which led to outrages, which the Irish Members must deplore as being the greatest enemies to the cause of self-government. He was bound to confess that some years ago he also believed in the policy of coercion, and had signed a Memorial in 1880 from the borough he now represented urging the Government to take whatever steps they thought necessary for the restoration of order in Ireland. In course of time many of them changed their opinions. Probably they did not study Irish history until the question became urgent; but they might save themselves the expense of investing in a history of Ireland by recognizing the fact that it was one long history of outrage by England for the last 700 years. It was to be feared that the landlords would follow the advice which had been given to them by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) to evict their tenants, knowing that they would be fully protected. It was difficult for those who sat on that—the Government—side of the House to propose any legislation which could be exactly agreeable to the Irish Members below the Gangway, who not only desired self-government for Ireland, but were in favour of the large scheme promoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). To that scheme he had given an unswerving support, although he did not pledge himself to the land measure introduced by the right hon. Gentleman. Therefore, he had no need to act upon the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), and separate himself from the main body of the Liberal Party. In addressing the House for the first time he wished to express his extreme sympathy with the cause of Ireland, and to assure Irish Members that there were many sitting on the Benches above the Gangway who would work heartily to aid them in carrying out the great object which they advocated and had at heart. In conclusion, he desired to express his thanks to the House for the courtesy with which they had heard him.

Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said, he felt some difficulty about giving a silent vote on the present occasion. And, first of all, he would ask the indulgence of the House while he made a remark chiefly of a personal character. He regretted that he should have been some few days ago —for the first time in 21 years—called to Order. So long as he had had a seat in that House he had never been called to Order from the Chair until that occasion, when he rose to protest against a statement of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The hon. Member for Cork stated in his place that Lord Carnarvon went over to Ireland as a Home Ruler, and that he did so with the knowledge of his Chief Secretary. Now, Lord Carnarvon had dealt with statements of this nature amply and fully again and again in "another place," and the noble Lord was perfectly able to take care of himself. But, for himself, he (Sir William Hart Dyke) wished, and was determined, to take the earliest opportunity of giving the most unqualified contradiction to the statement of the hon. Member that the English language could convey. It was right, further, to state this—that the very first knowledge, or even inkling of knowledge, that came to him that an interview had taken place between Lord Carnarvon and the hon. Member for Cork was some six months after he had resigned the Office of Chief Secretary for Ireland. He had in his possession a letter from the Earl of Carnarvon, written on the 13th of June last, in which the noble Earl gave ample reasons how it was and why it was—that that interview took place solely on the noble Earl's own responsibility and totally apart from any of his Colleagues in the Government—that he withheld all knowledge of it from his Chief Secretary. It might be urged that these matters, being personal, were of infinitesimal importance, having regard to the grave subjects raised in the debate; but, at the same time, he did not apologize for introducing them. The Office of Chief Secretary had never been a bed of roses to its occupants, although whoever took that charming position must be willing to accept all responsibility attaching to it. He noticed that whilst his Successor (Mr. John Morley) still occupied a seat down there on the Front Opposition Bench, he himself, with singular immodesty, as an ex-Chief Secretary, had at once taken a higher position in the House. Passing now to one or two matters that had emerged in the course of the debate, he was bound to say that, having listened with some careful attention to the speech of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), he found it, in a certain sense, one of the most difficult speeches to reply to that he had ever heard. The hon. Member for Sligo had travelled very far in his speech; and though many hon. Members might endeavour to follow him in what he had said, yet he believed that hon. Members on both sides of the House would endorse his statement that though that speech had been amusing in itself, and contained light personalities, yet he defied any candid man to say he could extract from it any solid argument why the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork should be accepted by the House, and the policy of Her Majesty's Government repudiated. It was true that the House had had a long and entangled discussion; and he, for one, pitied the Speaker during it. During all the time he had been in Parliament he had never known any occupant of the Chair who had had so much difficulty in dealing with his flock, and in stopping those sheep who wandered from the fold; but for his own part, if he should follow in the steps of previous wanderers, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman (the Speaker) that he would "downcharge" at the lifting of his little finger. This discussion, though somewhat lengthened, had not proved a useless one, either as regarded the position of Her Majesty's Government or of the House in general. During its progress they had discovered various things that were of value both to hon. Members of that House and to the constituencies of the country. In the first place, they had learned this from the careful and able speech of the hon. Member for Cork—that he and those who were now acting with him were prepared to say *non possumus* to any measure that the Government might propose for the material amelioration of Ireland, so long as they did not accept his formula of an independent Parliament sitting in Dublin. He did not think he was exaggerating what had been the meaning of that speech. It was of value to the House, and still more to the constituencies of this country, to gather for the first time that any measure proposed by the people of this country, or the Parliament of this country, for the amelioration of Ireland would be rejected unless the constituencies of this country were prepared to go back upon the course which they had adopted with so much decision a few months ago, and to accept the proposition of an Irish Parliament. They had learned another thing of equal value—the treatment that they on that side of the House were likely to receive in these Irish difficulties from the Front Opposition Bench. They had had a very long speech with reference to this Amendment from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). That speech had been a critical one; and though its language and manner had been very mild, yet he must say that the impression which that speech had left on his mind, and on the minds of those who sat on his side of the House, was that it conveyed an earnest desire to make the task of those who had succeeded the right hon. Gentleman as difficult and as thorny as possible. For his own part, he had heard with the greatest regret much that had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman with reference to this difficulty of the collection of rents in Ireland, considering the authority with which the right hon. Gentleman spoke. The impression which that speech had left on his mind was that, though the right hon. Gentleman had not asked the tenants of Ireland not to pay rent, he had given them a hint very much like that conveyed in the intimation—"Do not nail his ears to the pump." At the conclusion of his speech, the right hon. Gentleman had stated that the great difficulty with regard to the whole question was that, while England was governed according to English ideas and Scotland according to Scottish ideas, Ireland, on the other hand, was not in these matters governed according to Irish ideas. He would like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues followed that statement to its logical conclusion? Were they prepared to adopt the language which they heard upon the Irish Benches with regard to slavery in Ireland, when the fact that a man was compelled to meet the legal obligations into which he had entered was spoken of as slavery? On the very night when the right hon. Gentleman was making his speech upon the question in that House a speech had been made at a League meeting in Dublin by the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. Tuite), in which he had told his audience that—

> "The tenants must see, and the Irish people must see, that the land from which a tenant might be cast out must be made for every other man a curse instead of a blessing."

That was the programme of an hon. Member who sat below the Gangway; was it endorsed by his Colleagues on those Benches? If it were so, the sooner the people of this country knew it the better.

MR. TUITE (Westmeath, N.): As one of the Members for Westmeath, I deny having used such language.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): As the other Member for Westmeath, I also deny having used the words.

SIR WILLIAM HART DYKE: The words were reported as having been used by one of the Members of that Party; and the question was whether the late Prime Minister and his Colleagues endorsed such language? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had somewhat patronized the Government with regard to the difficulties in which they were placed, and had spoken of the complex question before them. The whole question was, indeed, complex and complicated enough; but what was the chief source of these complications? He held that the chief source of them was the past land legislation of the right hon. Gentleman. Speech after speech had been made in this debate from both sides of the House full of bitter denunciation of the policy of the Land Act of the right hon. Gentleman; and the complications which the right hon. Gentleman now talked of were the result of measures which had been denounced at their introduction, and which now had borne bitter fruit. The right hon. Gentleman himself had produced the worst complication of all when he had performed one of the biggest political somersaults ever executed by a British statesman. With regard to the great questions of evictions and the payment of rent raised by the hon. Member for Cork, for his own part he knew something about these difficulties. He would point out to the House that, while Her Majesty's Government were denounced from the Benches opposite because they asked for a Commission of Inquiry, every speech made in that debate proved not only that such an inquiry was necessary, but that any legislation attempted without it must inevitably fail. No statement had been made from his own side of the House with regard to this great Land Question which had not immediately been contradicted by hon. Members opposite; and he might also say that there were very few statements which had been made over there which had not been amply contradicted on his own side. That amply proved the necessity which existed for the inquiry which Her Majesty's Government demanded; and he held that unless the Government proceeded in that way it would be utterly impossible for them to carry out any legislation whatever. With regard to these evictions, he was not one of those who would regard with honour any man who dealt harshly or bitterly with tenants who could not pay. Those, however, who had been watching this question considered —whether rightly or wrongly—that there were many cases at this moment in Ireland where tenants were in difficulties and could not pay their rent; but they had also discovered that there were two classes, and they wanted an inquiry in order to discriminate between the two. There was a class of tenants who were in grave difficulties, and were unable to pay their rents. But there was a vast class, on the other hand, who were trading on the difficulties and disasters of their fellow-tenants, and who could pay and would not. Therefore, to ask Her Majesty's Government to go into some wholesale scheme for the relief of Irish tenants was most unjust and impolitic. Hon. Gentlemen talked as if this Land Question was merely an Irish one, and they ignored the sufferings of the English tenants. It was not an Irish question only. In England during the last 10 years there were thousands of farmers who had become bankrupt, and who had suffered without a murmur; and were we to tell them, as a reward for their loyalty and patience, that for them nothing would be done, while we were giving an ample measure of relief by State machinery to a huge number of Irish tenants who could pay and would not do so? He wished to urge that consideration in common justice when he heard those long denunciatory harangues against the British Parliament, and all those speeches about the impossibility of arranging our affairs without the intervention of two Parliaments. Why was the Land Purchase Act of 1885 so persistently ignored by hon. Gentlemen opposite? That was said to be the most liberal Act ever passed as regarded the tenants. It proposed to make the Irish tenant in 49 years absolute owner of his holding, relieved of all charges whatever except taxes. How was it that this Act had been left until now, with slight exceptions, practically inoperative? He could see when he went back to Ireland after the passing of the Act that it was frowned upon and its operation was blocked by the National League in Ireland. [*Cries of* "No!"] He stated facts which came before him. When he was in Dublin he had case after case mentioned to him where the tenants would have taken advantage of the Act; but a hint was given them that for the present, at all events, the Act was to remain inoperative. It had been urged that the judicial rents had been fixed without any regard to a future fall in prices. But it was impossible for any man who had been connected with land even for six weeks not to have brought to his notice what the fall in prices was likely to be. He maintained that the prospective fall in prices must have been taken into account by the Sub-Commissioners in fixing the rents, or, if not, the Commissioners were utterly unfit for the task before them; but he believed that most of the decisions as to the judicial rents were come to after three or four of the worst agricultural years which had been experienced in Ireland. He denied, moreover, that there had been such a fall in prices as it was sought to make out. As far as he understood the policy of the hon. Member for Cork, it was to shut up Ireland by herself, and restrict her from any trading operations with England. [*Cries of* "No!"] They had heard it, but he trusted it was not so. Would Ireland be the better for it? When he was in Ireland in July, 1885, butter was selling in Cork at 7*d.* per lb. An hon. Friend of his rather depreciated the value of the article; but he was romancing at the time. At that very moment in his own country they could get 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. for as much of that very butter as could be had. A charge had been constantly brought against Her Majesty's Government that under their scheme the taxpayers of this country were to be called upon to pay the difference between the judicial rent and that actually received by the landlords—so that they might not suffer. He had heard nothing from the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer to sustain such a charge, though he believed that by the Act of 1881 the State did take an enormous *onus* upon itself with regard to this question of rent, by its interference with freedom of contract between landlords and tenants. For himself, with regard to peasant proprietary, he did not believe that a complete system could be carried out for the benefit of Ireland. If it could be carried out fully it would be a good thing; but he did not believe in it, because there was a vast extent of land in Ireland on which the small occupier would be always on the verge of starvation. The rents of a great number of those small occupiers in the West of Ireland was not paid out of the land, but out of the wages of able-bodied members of the family, who came over to England for the harvest operations, saved their earnings, and took them back to pay the rent of their holdings. The labour question was not peculiar to Ireland—it extended to England also. At present the towns were being flooded by a large mass of the agricultural population, chiefly because a great extent of land was going out of cultivation; it was laid down in grass, and the labour accounts were reduced almost to *nil.* The consequence was a great pressure of labour in the large towns. And they proposed to remedy the evil by placing the whole of Ireland under one huge system of peasant proprietors. But how were they to live? In Galway, Mayo, and other counties there was a vast quantity of rock with bits of grass here and there where small holders could not subsist. Under a huge system of peasant proprietors they would put small squatters upon those patches, and the consequence would be that the evil would be aggravated. The certain result of the establishment of a peasant proprietary would be a misfortune rather than a blessing, for it would still more completely flood the labour markets of England with Irishmen, who would come over to earn the rents of their land during the havest. Among the working classes of this country the effect of Irish legislation upon the labour question in this country had been regarded as of the greatest importance. He mentioned this point in perfect good faith, because, however much hon. Members in that House might differ upon political subjects, his earnest hope was that they would all do their best to prevent anything like a collision between the working classes of England and Ireland. He should like to conclude his remarks by one sentence, which was possibly out of Order; but he hoped that the indulgence of the House would be accorded to him on the ground that he had endeavoured to be good so far. He trusted that hon. Members from Ireland would agree that, whatever opposition he and those who thought with him might offer to the proposal for a separate Parliament for Ireland, they were all desirous to obtain that which they honestly believed would be for the good of that country. What he disliked so much in this debate was the assumption on the part of Irish Members that English Members who sat on the Government side of the House were animated by hostile feelings towards Ireland, and were desirous of retarding its progress and its prosperity. For his part, he repudiated any notion of the kind. He went further, and he wished that that identity of policy by successive Governments which had been so strongly approved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as applied to the foreign policy of this country could be applied also to Ireland. He could nol help thinking how different would have been the relations between Ireland and this country during the last 10 or 15 years if there had been something like a continuity of policy adopted towards Ireland by both Parties as they successively came into power. On this matter both Parties had been to blame. He confessed that he had been in former times as bitter a partizan as any man; but he now deeply regretted that Ireland should have been made the football between the contending Parties in the State, which was the reason why the Irish problem was now the most difficult that had ever vexed the souls of politicians. He desired, however, to address one word of warning to hon. Members opposite. We had lately passed through the trouble of an Election in this country; and he was satisfied that the verdict which had been given by the country, hostile to a separate Parliament for Ireland, would, if again challenged, be given in a manner ten times more strong than that which had just been delivered.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Sir, although I do not agree with several things which have been said by the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken, yet I think that most of us will agree with him when he said that every hon. Member in this House has the good of Ireland at heart. The object of a deliberative Assembly such as this is to secure the good of the commonwealth. I shall not detain the House long with any remarks I have to make upon the Amendment; but as the House has now heard speeches from all sections of it, from orthodox Conservatives, Irish Nationalists, orthodox Liberals, and hybrid Liberals, perhaps it is not out of place if a Radical unattached should give his view of the Amendment before the House. I may have had for a moment, perhaps, some misgiving whether the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) ought to be added to an Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne; but I can assure you, Sir, that all my doubts were entirely removed after I heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain). I speak impartially in the matter, because all of us know the attitude which the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) took up in the General Election of 1885. The hon. Member put out a Manifesto to the constituency for which I was standing, directing them to vote against me, and the consequence was that I was kept out of the last Parliament. I appear here to-day to return good for evil; and the best return I can make is carefully to examine the Amendment which has been put on the Paper, and to give my unbiased opinion whether it ought to be carried or not. Now, the first clause of the Amendment declares that—

> "Owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and that many will be unable to pay those rents at all."

That is admitted to be true by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. The second clause naturally follows from the first. The second clause observes that in that state of things—

> "Numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing wide-spread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order, will be the result."

Well, Sir, that is the Irish Question. Eviction is almost the whole of the Irish Question as I understand it. In my heart I regard it as the Irish Question in its intensity. In Ireland—although we have had such difficulty in governing it, and we have not been able to govern it for the last 85 years—in Ireland, I believe, there is less ordinary crime than in almost any other country. And the question of evictions is really and truly at the bottom of the whole Irish Question. Then comes the third clause of the Amendment; and I do not understand that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham really objects even to that clause. The third clause says—

> "That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are."

I am very glad that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham approves of that also. But that is not the opinion of Her Majesty's Government. What does the right hon. Gentleman say?

He says that he does not consent that any money whatever shall be expended for that purpose. But when we take the declaration of Her Majesty's Government, not in this House, but "elsewhere," we find it most distinctly and positively asserted that the public money should be given to those landlords whose rents fall short. Then I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham whether his version of what the Government are going to do, or the Government's own version, is the correct one? The right hon. Gentleman said that he did not like to speak in this House of an absent man, who had no opportunity of giving an explanation. But I should like to ask if he has made any inquiry? Has he tried to get an explanation, or any correction, of the reported utterances of the Head of the Government? If not, he stands in the most peculiar position in which any statesman ever yet stood. For my part, I believe the Government when they say that they are going to pay the public money in recompense to those landlords whose rents fall short. I assume that that is their opinion still. If it is not their opinion, why do they not accept the Amendment now before the House? If they do not propose to give the money of the State to the landlords, let them say so. Let us not be put to the trouble of a division; but let them assert the principle which is contained in the Amendment. If the House is to go to a division I shall certainly give my vote in favour of the Amendment; because I shall believe that Her Majesty's Government, when they declare a particular thing, mean what they say. Now, Sir, I do not think this Amendment involves any difficult matter after all. I think it is easily understood; and I want to know what inducement there is for any real Liberal Member to vote against it at the instigation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham? Why, the very fact that the right hon. Gentleman said he would oppose it is one of the reasons that would make me support it. Are the men who have been returned to this House by Tory votes to influence the conduct of Liberal Members? I trow not, Sir. They may assume what they like; they may say what they like; they may sit where they like; but they are Tories pure and simple. They are advocating Tory doctrines; they are supporting a Tory policy; and they are the great supporters of the Tory Government. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham says that he supports Her Majesty's Government. He either does not mean what he says, or he is going to support a policy which he himself says is most mischievous, and will be most disastrous to the country. He has told us that it would be one of the most unjust measures that could possibly be conceived, to make up by public money the loss to the Irish landlords. I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman should be in such a position. Certainly, he has taken very extraordinary courses lately. One hardly knows where to find him, or where to have him. He is like a man I heard of the other day—a farm servant—who took very eccentric courses, and did very extraordinary things. One day the farmer in whose service he was went into a barn, and found that the man had hanged himself. Looking at him with astonishment, he said—"I wonder what that man will do next!" The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has great confidence in the policy which he has declared to the House.

MR. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington): I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, if the hon. Baronet is in Order in pursuing that special line of argument?

MR. SPEAKER: I am following the hon. Baronet in order to see the application of his remarks.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: I shall be happy to state, in a moment, the application of my remarks. I was telling a story about a man who had hanged himself, and the application was to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Baronet had better confine himself strictly to the Amendment before the House.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: I will endeavour, Sir, to obey your ruling; but it is exceedingly difficult for me, or for any of us, to confine ourselves to the Amendment, after such a bad example as that which we have had from the right hon. Baronet opposite the Member for Dartford (Sir William Hart Dyke). But, Sir, I will confine myself strictly to the speech which was made by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham.

After he had described his policy at full length, the right hon. Gentleman said that he would pledge himself, if the Government appealed to the country on the subject, that the result would be similar to what it was at the last Election. That was the pledge the right hon. Gentleman gave. I will give no pledge; but I will give a promise. I say that the right hon. Gentleman will find himself very much mistaken. Does he remember what took place in 1885? Why did the Irish oppose the Liberal Party? [*Cries of* "Order!"] Am I to reply to the speech of the right hon Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, or is he to speak in this House and is nobody to reply to him? I know that the right hon. Gentleman is the autocrat of Her Majesty's Government; but he is not the autocrat of this House, and we have a right to reply to whatever he says. I shall therefore reply to him, unless you, Mr. Speaker, say that he is infallible. [*Cries of* "Order!"] Well, I have done. All I say is, as I said before, that the right hon. Gentleman will find himself very much mistaken when he goes to the country next time. He will find that the country will overthrow one of the most mischievous and one of the most miserable political combinations which have ever been seen in this country, and which at present bars the way to the tranquillity of Ireland, and the real, genuine, and lasting union of the two nations.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Mr. Speaker, if I do not vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), it is not because I am in a position to deny any one of the statements that are contained in it. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] If I may be permitted to refer to my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), so far I am in exactly the same position as he was. He stated that he agreed with every statement in the Amendment; but he said he was going to vote against it. Now, I am not going to do that, and therefore I do not go so far as my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. He had a very easy method of accounting for the course he was going to take, and although it is impossible that I can adopt it, it would very much facilitate all political action if his method were pursued. He said that he agreed with all the statements in the Amendment. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] His exact phrase was, that with regard to the statements in the Amendment he had no objection to make. ["No, no!"] That is the correct rendering of what my right hon. Friend said. ["No, no!"] It is precisely what he stated. ["No, no!"] At any rate, it can be verified at any time by a reference to the report of the speech of my right hon. Friend. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he agreed with the Amendment; but whether he agreed with it or differed from it he was going to vote against it, for it would disturb the position of Her Majesty's Government. He said he felt bound to wait for the plans they had announced, and to give them a careful and favourable consideration. My right hon. Friend is not always in exactly that accommodating spirit. It is only about six or seven months ago, when the same Government was sitting in the same place, and my right hon. Friend was sitting much in the same place which he occupied last night, when a great friend and ally of his, now another of the Members for Birmingham (Mr. Jesse Collings), brought forward an Amendment to the Address of the Government of that day. It was an Amendment which had reference to the Land Question, and it condemned the Government on the ground of their not having brought forward some satisfactory proposition with reference to the Land Question in England. The Government alleged, as they allege now, that they were going to legislate upon the subject, and that they were going to bring forward a plan with reference to the Land Question in England. [*Cries of* "Order!"] I think I am quite in Order—I am criticizing the course taken by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham on the Amendment by referring to his conduct with reference to a cognate subject. [*Cries of* "Order!"] I do not wonder that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin) is a little sensitive on that subject, because he played a distinguished part on that occasion.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I rise to Order. I wish to know, Sir, whether the right hon. Gentleman is in Order in making reference to a debate which took place last Session, on a Motion moved in another Parliament, which has nothing whatever to do with the Amendment now under discussion?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that his remarks had reference to a cognate subject.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: If this contention is set up, I must say that I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) that it is preposterous that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham should, for an hour by the clock, stand here abusing all the Gentlemen among whom he sits, and yet that we are not to be allowed to reply to him. That is a contention which I confess would make Parliamentary life intolerable.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): I must rise to Order. [*Cheers and cries of* "Shame!" *from the Home Rule Benches.*] Mr. Speaker, I am bound, Sir, to ask you, in the interests of the order of debate in this House—["Oh, oh!"]—whether the last remark of the right hon. Gentleman opposite was consistent with due respect to the Chair? ["Oh, oh!"] You yourself, Mr. Speaker, I will remind you, repeatedly called the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to Order during the course of his speech. You distinctly prohibited the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth from travelling beyond the limits of the Amendment, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite who is now leading the Opposition—["Order, order!"]

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): Sir, I rise to Order. [*Home Rule cheers.*]

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the noble Lord is in Order? [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer has himself risen to a point of Order. I call upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: The noble Lord is making a speech.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: In rising to a point of Order, the point of Order to which I feel bound in the interests of debate and the dignity of this House—["Oh, oh!"]—to direct your attention is, whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, by his last, remark has not distinctly questioned the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer rightly, he accuses the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby of having spoken of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham as abusing his Colleagues, and of infringing the dignity and order of the Chair. Of course, any interpretation of that kind would be quite out of Order, for if the right hon. Gentleman had transgressed I should have called him to Order. A further point of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is, whether the right hon. Gentleman was justified in following the course for which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was called to Order. That I understand to be the question put to me by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I must say that I do not consider that when a right hon. Gentleman has pursued a course which has brought him under the notice of the Chair, and required him to be called to Order, the remarks he had made are a fit subject for subsequent discussion.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: It is not in my recollection that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham was called to Order for stating that he was about to support Her Majesty's Government under all circumstances. That was the remark upon which my observations were founded. Upon that I stated that that was not the course which the right hon. Gentleman had on all occasions followed; and I was also going to point out that, with reference to that course, my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham had given his reasons, upon a former occasion, for not taking the same course which he said he would take on the present occasion. I was about to refer to what he had stated. He said, on the 26th of January—

> "If it is asked why we have thought it necessary to support an Amendment hostile to the Government, and why we have not waited for the proposals they intend to make, we say that we support the Amendment because we have no confidence that the Government will either do justice to the agricultural labourer, or to any question with which they may have to deal."

Now, I say that that is a course which is not entirely consistent with the principle which the right hon. Gentleman laid down last night. Well, my right hon. Friend has stated that he is going to vote against this Amendment on account of the complete confidence he has in the intentions of Her Majesty's Government, and that he is going to support the Government in consequence of the complete distrust he has of my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dartford (Sir William Hart Dyke) has said, it is well that some of these positions should be cleared up, and I think that they have been cleared up by this debate. Sir, I do not quite understand the tone in which my right hon. Friend addressed us last night. I do not understand the meaning of that extraordinary soreness which he seemed to display. He always speaks on these subjects to the Gentlemen among whom he sits as if he were sore all over. We have none of that feeling towards him. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Well, I can speak for myself; I have not. He addresses us in a tone very different from that of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). My noble Friend, we are sorry to know, differs from us fundamentally upon the question of this Amendment. But he admitted frankly the other night that he did not claim to represent the majority of the Liberal Party. He claimed, of course, to exercise his own discretion in this matter, and to act upon his own judgment; but he did not presume to denounce the Liberal Party for their conduct. The noble Marquess did not, like the right hon. Gentleman, tell the Liberal Party that they would wander for 40 years in the wilderness until they cast themselves at his feet and adopted the principles which he has laid down. Well, Sir, we may have to wander in the wilderness. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Ministerial Benches.*] Oh, yes; that happened to the "Chosen People" before they entered upon the Promised Land. But they did not follow the first man who invited them to go after the fleshpots of Egypt. Sir, it was the lot of the Liberal Party, at the end of the last and at the commencement of the present century, to wander for many years in the wilderness of Opposition on account of their fidelity to their principles, some of which were very closely connected with the Irish Question. Every species of prejudice was roused against them; and if my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham thinks that the Liberal Party of to-day are unequal to the sacrifices which were made in former days, and which are regarded as the most glorious period of their history, when they had to fight against the Tory Party and the seceding Liberals of those days, he will find he is very much mistaken. And if he thinks that by threats of exclusion from Office he can coerce us into a blind support of a Tory Government and a Tory policy, I can assure him that he does not understand the spirit of those Gentlemen with whom he has to deal. Whatever may be the case with my right hon. Friend, we at least claim the right to examine this Amendment upon its merits by the light of Liberal principles. Now, Sir, my right hon. Friend says that he has been ostracized by the Liberal Party. Why, Sir, I think it is rather the other way. He has ostracized the Liberal Party on his own single shell. That is my reply to the right hon. Gentleman; and I will now, Sir, go directly to the words of this Amendment. This Amendment deals, first of all, with the subject of rent. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) complained of me the other day for what I had said upon the subject of rent. Now, I did not introduce the question of rent. What I said upon the subject was a commentary upon the language of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to rent. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary says that I have written up "no rent" and run away. I have done neither the one nor the other. I have not written up "no rent," and I have certainly not run away. I thought it necessary to point out the danger which would inevitably arise from the language employed by the noble Lord. I said I thought it was a provocation—whether so intended or not—of course, I judge no man's intentions, but I judge only the natural consequence of his words—and I said I thought it was in the character of a provocation to conflict. The noble Lord's language rather reminded me of an epigrammatic phrase which has been productive of such remarkable effects "elsewhere"—that what he said about rent might have been condensed into a single phrase — "The landlords will fight and the landlords will be right." I thought it necessary to point out that effect and to protest against the danger of language of that description. I am happy to say that that interpretation has been entirely repudiated by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. I think, if the debate had only produced that result, it has not been without its use. I think the right hon. Gentleman fulfils a very useful part. Sitting by the noble Lord, he is always there to explain away the noble Lord, and to repair the occasional indiscretions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Well, Sir, this question of rent is urgent. It is admitted, as it is stated in this Amendment, that it has, and must have, a direct effect upon social order. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dartford said—"How comes this question to be complicated? How comes social order to be involved in rents? It is all in consequence of the legislation of the Party who sit on that side of the House." [*Ministerial cheers.*] Oh, yes; there never were any agrarian disturbances before the Land Act of 1870! Is it the right hon. Gentleman's experience, from his brief residence in Ireland as Chief Secretary, that agrarian disturbance and agrarian discontent and the evils of Ireland arose for the first time in 1881, or 1870? I think he has still something to learn, if he is of that opinion. But we are told by the Government—"We are going to have a Commission, and you ought to wait for that Commission." Well, Sir, but there are some people who cannot wait for this Commission. The Government say they have no intuition upon this question. Well, there is a large class of people who do not want intuition. They understand it thoroughly by bitter experience. They know they are not likely to require information from a Commission on the subject. We have had, in the course of the debate, a great deal of *à priori* reasoning as to the value of rents. We have been told, of course, that the Land Commission took into account the future depreciation which was to take place. Well, Sir, I must say that seems to me to be a most improbable and unreasonable theory. Even if we have not in the hon. Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahony) a very competent witness as to the fact that they did not and could not have done so, how could any surveyor, or land agent, in settling the rent for a lease, say of 15 years, in England, speculate upon a future depreciation, of which he could know nothing, or on a future rise in prices? What he does is what any sensible man would do. He looks back over 15 years, and in fixing the rent he is guided by the fluctuations of the past, and not by the fluctuations of the future, of which he knows nothing. Then we have all sorts of explanations to get rid of the fact of this alteration in value. The noble Lord thinks that it is the bad butter of Ireland. We had another very original theory from the hon. and gallant Member for North Down (Colonel Waring), who thought that the distress of the Irish peasantry was due to the fine gowns worn by the daughters of farmers in Ireland. But we have had some important testimony on the subject from a Gentleman who sits on this side of the House, and is, I believe, a follower of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale—namely, the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), who spoke, I think, yesterday, and who commenced his speech by saying, what is perfectly true, and what I have no doubt his constituents would expect him to say, that the fall in prices has been such that the present rents cannot be maintained. This is important and impartial testimony. A Gentleman mentioned to me to-night an important resolution which has been carried in County Down, in flourishing Ulster, to the effect that in the present state of prices rents cannot be maintained. I alluded the other day to the opinion of Sir James Caird, and I have been greatly taken to task in doing so; but I was not the first person who cited Sir James Caird in this House. The Gentleman who vouched him as a witness was my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. I am bound to say he did not concur altogether in the opinion of Sir James Caird; but he pointed out what I have pointed out also —what an enormous and necessary effect the expression of that opinion must have had upon the minds of the tenantry of Ireland. But I take neither the opinion of landlords on this matter, nor the opinion of the representatives of the tenants, as I think both of them are likely to be pretty strongly biased. I am perfectly willing, if you please, to accept the view that Sir James Caird is a reckless sort of writer, who says things he does not mean, on very important subjects—who says one thing one day and recalls it another. Well, I will accept that view of Sir James Caird's character, if you please. But I saw the other day a very important piece of evidence upon this subject, given by a witness who, I think, will be considered to be a valid and important witness. He was a witness before the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade—Mr. Murrough O'Brien—who is superintendent of land sales under the Land Commission, and is probably a man who knows as much on this subject as anybody you will be able to put upon your Commission. This is what he told you last March of the fall in the price of cattle, which is one of the main elements of depression in Ireland. First of all, he says, that store cattle have fallen 50 per cent below the prices of 1877 and 1878. Now, that is a very important statement—a more important statement, I think, than anything which was said by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the bad manufacture of butter—and I would refer hon. Members, without waiting for the close of spring, if they require information upon this subject, to that gentleman's evidence. I will not detain the House by reading more than one single answer. He says—

> "I do not think, as long as prices are so very low, that the existing rents, taxes, and the subsistence of the population can be provided for as they ought to be—that is, I do not think the existing rents can be maintained under the depression if it continues. If they are maintained, it means that some of the population must go, or live in a very much poorer way than they do at present."

Now, Sir, I venture to say that that is as good authority as that of any Commission you may be able to appoint; but, as this matter is of such infinite and urgent importance, I will venture to refer to another authority. This is not a National League authority, nor an authority biased in any way by the conflicting interests in Ireland. It is an authority that all the House will respect. It is the Report—and a Report which is on the Table of the House—of Mr. Tuke upon the question of the condition of Ireland. Now, I will not refer specially to the part which relates to the Island of Achill, because I know the circumstances of that particular case are singular, and should not be taken as a specimen of the condition of the country generally, except this, which I will quote even of Achill. Mr. Tuke says that he asked a merchant at Westport whether the rents were paid, and he answered—"Yes, up to March, 1885; but now it is impossible." And he gave as a reason for it, among others, that they could then get a price for cattle; but that now, if they drove the cattle to the fairs, they could not get a price, and the shopmen would not give them a bag of meal (14*s.*) for a beast. They had sold cows for 15*s.*, and now had no milk for their own family. "And this," says Mr. Tuke, "is due to the impossibility of getting a sale for the cattle. I have heard it everywhere." But I pass from the Island of Achill to the mainland of Ireland—to the coast of Connaught. [*A laugh.*] The coast of Connaught, with all respect to the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) is the mainland of Ireland. It is not an island, although Ireland is. So entirely is the noble Lord denationalizing Ireland that he will not allow me to speak of the coast of Connaught as being on the mainland of Ireland. Subject to that interpretation, Mr. Tuke says—these are the notes that he took—

> "In this visit I had the great advantage of being accompanied by Mr. A. E. Horne, the Resident Magistrate, whose acquaintance with the district and sympathy with the people gave much added weight to any information I might obtain."

Then he says—

> "John Malley's rent is £2 4*s.* He paid his rent last November two years, but could pay none since. This is the case with every man in Clewbay."

Mr. Tuke goes on to say—

> "One man who had one cow took it to five fairs, and he was not even asked the price of it."

[*A laugh.*] Oh, you may laugh at these things! I was sorry to hear the laugh of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). I am sure that he does not mean a want of sympathy.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I did not laugh; I only smiled.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I will read the hon. and gallant Gentleman something he will not even smile at. Mr. Tuke says—

> "In the village (Doobeg) there are 13 houses, in which 87 people live. Hugh Cattigan's daughter lately died for want of proper nourishment, and he had not the few shillings necessary to buy a coffin for her, until his neigh-

bours, who are almost as poor as himself, subscribed the pence which they received for the eggs sold, and the Mulvanny police subscribed their shillings to buy the boards required to make the coffin."

I will go on now with the question of rent and the fall in agricultural prices. Mr. Tuke continues—

> "Martin Patton's circumstances are about the same. He sold a four-year-old cow after calving for £3, and was at three fairs before he succeeded in selling her. He sold her in Newport Fair, and bought Indian meal with the price of her, but that is all used now. He bought this cow last year at Achill Fair, from a man named Cafferkey, of Meelin, for £11."

For which, be it remembered, he could only get £3. Mr. Tuke proceeds—

> "The police who accompanied us stated that the people are far worse off now than in 1879-80, and that not one of the Doobeg men has potatoes to sow. They saw them dig them last harvest, and they were not worth digging, being no bigger than marbles."

I do not feel justified in detaining the House by reading more. ["Hear, hear!"] I am sorry that hon. Members opposite should be so impatient at being told these facts, because they are the very facts that they declare they desire to know. After all the speeches we have heard on the other side of the House, ridiculing and throwing doubt upon the existence of this distress, and asserting that the fall of prices has not made a difficulty about paying rent—[*Cries of* "No!"]—after all that has been said on the other side of the House, I think it is necessary that people should understand the magnitude of the evil, and the greatness and urgency of the danger that is involved. [An hon. MEMBER: The example is not a fair one.] The hon. Member says it is not a fair example. Then he must allow me to record one more sentence. Mr. Tuke says—

> "It would be quite beyond the limits of this Report to give details as full as the above of all the districts visited during a journey prolonged over a period of two months, and extending over large portions of Mayo and Galway. Suffice it to say that these faithfully represent the condition of thousands of the small holders of land scattered along the whole coast line of Connaught."

Mr. Tuke, I need not say, is not an agitator, and that he is not saying these things, or painting a gloomy picture, for base political purposes. This is the very evidence hon. Members opposite profess to desire as to the real condition of the tenantry of Ireland; and Mr. Tuke tells us most distinctly that the effect of the fall of prices is to render them unable to pay rent. [*Cries of* "No!"] The area of special destitution which he points out is West of a line drawn from Derry to Skibbereen, and he says that it represents one-third of Ireland. The population which lies to the West of that line, he says, is in a state of poverty and destitution. But in that state of things what are the Government going to do? That is the practical question which we have a right to ask, and it is the question raised directly by this Amendment. Now, there is one man who, undoubtedly, foresaw the character of the present danger, and the inevitable consequences of it. That man is my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. In April last, he said that there had been a fall in prices of from 20 to 40 per cent. He now says 20 to 30 per cent; but if there has been a fall of prices of from 20 to 30 per cent even, you do not want any Commission to tell you that that practically concludes the question. Where in the world is there any industry which can continue to pay rents with a fall in the profits of 20 to 30 per cent? Take land which yields a profit of £5 per acre. Would such land be able to pay rent? But if it be true, as my right hon. Friend said, that the fall of prices has been from 20 to 40 per cent, it practically concludes the question. My right hon. Friend gave an illustration which goes further than that. He said that this agrarian question is necessarily connected with the question of political discontent. An hon. Member opposite referred to what I had said in regard to the Bread Tax. I spoke of my own experience in the year 1843, when, in the midst of bread riots at that time, men were shot down in the streets of Preston. I was there at the time, and the very illustration which occurred to my right hon. Friend in his argument occurred also to me, but for an exactly opposite purpose. This was before the repeal of the Corn Laws, and there was, undoubtedly, great disorder in those days. There were the Chartists and the Bread Riots. There came, however, a subsequent period, which was the period referred to by my right hon. Friend, and then, although the sufferings of the people of Lancashire were as great, perhaps greater, yet he is quite right in saying that they were borne with exemplary patience. But why? Because they occurred years after 1843, and they were not complicated by political discontent. The people knew that the evils from which they were suffering were not caused by mischievous legislation. Well, my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham foresaw all this. He said—"There will be a disturbance. Prices will fall, rents cannot be paid, political discontent will arise, and the Government must do something at once." What did he propose? He proposed to stay evictions for six months. Does he propose that now? Does he urge it upon Her Majesty's Government now? His proposal was a stay of evictions for six months, and not the issue of a Commission. But he is ready now to inquire, by Commission or by a Committee composed of all Parties in this House, into the best method of removing the political discontent of Ireland, by devising the best scheme of Home Rule. [*Cries of* "No!"] Yes; the right hon. Gentleman said so. In so many words, he declared his readiness, if the two Bills of the late Government were withdrawn, to vote cordially for a Resolution for establishing a Legislative Body in Ireland for dealing with Irish affairs. I am, therefore, entitled to claim my right hon. Friend as a witness to the necessity for dealing with this question. He complains that the proposal of his for the stay of evictions was not encouraged, and that my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) said that it would not have been an easy one to carry, suggesting that the difficulty would have come from the Irish Members below the Gangway. What I said at the time to my right hon. Friend was—"This is an admirable proposal; but have you got the consent of your allies to it? What does the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) say to it? What does Mr. Goschen say—what does the Tory Party say to the proposal to stay evictions?" My right hon. Friend, who, a few months ago, was profoundly impressed with the danger of the situation, is now prepared to support the Government in a course which will certainly afford no remedy at all for six months. What is the plan the Government have for dealing with this state of things in reference to rents? My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne says it is rather difficult to ascertain what is their real view. It is, however, of great importance to know what it is, and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland will have an opportunity of making it perfectly clear. Do they or do they not—we ought to have a definite answer to the question—do they or do they not admit that the judicial rents ought to be dealt with if it should be found that those judicial rents are too high? If they admit that the judicial rents ought to be dealt with, do they contend, as it has been contended, that the difference between the judicial rents and the fair rents, in the present state of prices, is to be paid out of the pockets of the ratepayers for the benefit of the landlords? My right hon. Friend the Member for Dartford (Sir William Hart-Dyke), who spoke so well just now, professed entire ignorance and astonishment that anybody should propound so preposterous a doctrine, and he said he could not think where it came from. I cannot tell him where it came from, but I will tell him what it is—

> "If it should come out that there is any impossibility in paying rent, I think it is not the landlords who should bear the loss. I think this should be one of the cases for the application of the principle of purchase by the State, and that the State, and not the landlords, should bear the loss."

That was the statement of the Prime Minister. Now, I call upon the Government in this House—this is the House which represents the taxpayers—the House of Lords does not represent the taxpayers, and we have the right to demand of Her Majesty's Government in this matter whether they accept that proposition which I have quoted, or whether they do not? It is perfectly ridiculous to suppose that the Prime Minister of this country should make statements of that character, and that we should not know whether they are seriously meant or whether they are all a farce. Therefore, I ask the Government to give some explanation in reference to that statement. If the statement is accepted by the Government, I hope, at all events, it will not be supported by my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. My right hon. Friend said so, and I hope he will abide by it. He said—and there are undoubtedly traces of his early manner in what he said—

> "At all events, I do not admit for a moment that there is any sanctity about judicial or any other rents."

[Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Hear, hear!] Why, that is the author of the doctrine of ransom. The words are there, but I want to see the action. The voice is the voice of Jacob; but we want to see what the hands are like. My right hon. Friend went on to say—

> "If rent cannot be paid so as to leave a bare subsistence to the tenants, there is no doubt that the landlords must bear the loss."

I want to know whether the Government accept the doctrine of their supporter, the chief advocate of their policy, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham? It is imputed to the Government that—

> "Under no conceivable circumstances will they touch judicial rents, even if the Commission were to report in favour of the reduction; but my own impression is quite different."

Well, that must have been obtained from some private communication. He continues—

> "I have not understood that the Government have pledged themselves in such a way as to the future, and it would be very unreasonable that they should do so. If any Commission reported in the sense I have suggested, no Government would undertake the responsibility of maintaining the judicial rents."

I ask the Government—Do they accept that statement, that no Government will undertake the responsibility of maintaining the judicial rents? That is the view which my right hon. Friend takes of the policy of the Government. And now let me read the statement of the Government upon that subject from the mouth of the noble Lord. The noble Lord said—

> "A serious mistake will be made by anybody who thinks that the Government contemplate any further dealing with the Land Question in Ireland in the direction of any revision of the rents by the interposition of the State; that is altogether apart from the policy of the present Government."

My right hon. Friend says—

> "I have not understood that the Government have pledged themselves in such a way as to the future, and it would be very unreasonable that they should do so. If any Commission reported in the sense I have suggested, no Government would undertake the responsibility of maintaining the judicial rents."

Looking at the statement of my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham, and comparing it with that of the noble Lord, I must congratulate the Government upon having so admirable an exponent of their policy as the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman explains away all its weak points, and assures the House that the Government—neither Lord Salisbury nor the noble Lord opposite—really do intend the things that they have said. The right hon. Gentleman will stand bail for them; he is the real author, the real director, of the policy of the Government. Why, they have only half learnt their lesson. The right hon. Gentleman says that the policy of the Government is not understood by those who have accepted it, and it is necessary that he should get up to explain away the blunders that they have made. Is nothing to be done? My right hon. Friend has spoken of the effects of political discontent. Yes, you may abuse political discontent as much as you like; but, as long as you do not remove it, it will always act upon people in distress; and distress, where political discontent exists, will always be much more productive of social disorder than distress where political discontent does not exist so much. Why has Ireland, for the last 12 months, been comparatively happy and tranquil under the Government of Lord Carnarvon and Lord Aberdeen? Why, because the people of Ireland had hopes. But beware you do not deprive the people in distress of hope; that is the way to compel them and to provoke them to the resistance of despair. These are the warnings which it is our duty to give. We have tried to remove the cause of discontent; you have refused to do so; with you must rest the responsibility; it is our duty, and we have the right, to point this out. No doubt, the Government will denounce me for pointing it out. Oh, yes; I remember the time when the same language was used towards Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. They were denounced as the authors of social disorder. Nothing is more striking in that way than the painful reflection that even such a man as Sir Robert Peel could rise in the House of Commons and accuse Mr. Cobden of inciting to assassination—unworthy language from whomsoever it proceeds. On the subject of Land Purchase, the right hon. Member for West Birmingham said a good deal that was very characteristic of him; it was a favourite subject of attack on the policy of the last Government in the mouth of my right hon. Friend. As I have shown, he condemned the principle of the Land Purchase scheme as indicated by Lord Salisbury and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but, nevertheless, he is going to vote against the Amendment and in support of Her Majesty's Government, having complete confidence in them for the future. But he will not allow us to object to a scheme of that character. He insists that we must support the scheme of Her Majesty's Government, although he differs from it; but he says—"This is exactly like your scheme." If it is exactly like our scheme, it is a little hard upon us that he will not allow us to be converted by his eloquence and arguments. He says —"You are bound in honour to stick to the Land Bill of the late Government; that scheme—which I have demonstrated to the people of the United Kingdom—is injurious to the interests of everybody. I will not allow you to abandon it; honour demands that you should adhere to it." And if we do not he threatens us with the most terrible of all fates—we shall be Dissenting Liberals. "You will become," he says, "even like myself." That is a terrible threat. Hon. Gentlemen behind should beware of it; he will allow us no repentance; we must stick to the Land Bill of the late Government in order that we may perish in our sins. He says the country at the last Election gave an irrevocable and irreversible verdict; but, in spite of that irrevocable and irreversible verdict, my right hon. Friend says — "You cannot and shall not abandon the Land Bill." Well, I am not myself a great believer in irrevocable and irreversible verdicts. My earliest political recollections are of a great Conservative Parliament, elected with a real Conservative majority, in the year 1841, to maintain the sacred doctrines of Protection. That was the irrevocable and irreversible verdict given by the constituencies. It was the issue put to the country; and yet that very Parliament, with that very Ministry, repealed the Corn Laws. So much for irrevocable and irreversible verdicts. If there was anything of an irrevocable and irreversible verdict pronounced at the last Election, I should say it was pronounced on the subject of the Land Act. I hope my right hon. Friend will allow us to seek salvation with him. Still, our scheme was a totally different one from that propounded in outline by the Government. I will not go into details, as that has been amply done already; but besides the additional security that we offered — disparage it if you will, it was something more than the Government offered—there were collateral securities they do not propose; there was the important distinction that it left the Irish Government to collect the rents, and it did not call upon the English Government to collect the rents. In my opinion that was a very important distinction. It did another thing still more important. It was part of the scheme for giving political contentment to Ireland, whereas yours is part of a scheme for refusing it. But the plan of the Government raises enormous sums which are to fall simply and directly upon English credit. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham says he has always been in favour of a great Land Purchase scheme. I thought he had always said he had been in favour of Home Rule. I cannot say that his efforts in promotion of these two causes have been singularly successful. What has been his action? It appears now that any scheme of Home Rule probably not favoured by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, or any Land Scheme which commended itself to the late Prime Minister, are to be regarded, if it comes from those opposite, with some favour. But so determined was he to make war on the late Prime Minister and his Land Bill, that he struck out right and left, and the arguments he used and the appeals he made to the interests, prejudices, and passions of every section of the community were arguments and appeals which were fatal, and will be fatal hereafter to every scheme of Land Purchase. ["Question!"] Now, in speaking on the second reading of the Land Purchase Bill, what did he say? He said—"Remember the precedent you are making." These are the arguments which destroyed the Land Purchase Bill of the late Government, and will destroy the scheme of the present Government. He said—

"If I had no other reason for objecting to the proposal, one sufficient reason would be that before long you may want all this money for yourselves. You are refusing aid to the people of Scotland, you are refusing State aid to the crofters, one of the most deserving classes in the Kingdom. You cannot refuse it to the crofters and the agricultural labourers of England, and grant it to the people of Ireland. These are considerations which the House will do well to weigh before the second reading of the Bill."

Yes, Sir, I admit the force of these arguments, and I tell my right hon. Friend, in making those arguments popular, he has destroyed in advance the Land Bill, not only of the last Government, but the Bill of the Government that has come after them. Well, then, he said we are bound to treat the question of Home Rule and the question of Land Purchase as inseparable. He has tried to pin us to that, but he will not succeed in doing so. He cannot have his irrevocable and irreversible verdict, and yet treat it as if it had never taken place; and I say, in answer to my right hon. Friend, and I am speaking the opinions of my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian, that the two questions are not inseparable. [An hon. MEMBER: How will the landlords like that?] There is nothing new about it. Did not my right hon. Friend warn you some months ago that "the sands were running out?" I do not say that the Land Purchase Bill is a bad thing in itself. I think that a great number of arguments can be advanced in its favour; but, Sir, the Conservative Party, by the language they held at the last Election, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, have done all they can to make it impossible to pass it. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale boasted that he had been so discreet as to say nothing about it. Well, considering the noble Marquess's position in reference to Ireland, there is nothing surprising in his discretion. Now, Sir, you may depend upon it, that whenever the Tory Party come to propose a Land Bill, it is not only from this side of the House that they will meet with opposition, but I venture to say that they will meet with very strong opposition from the other side of the House. The Tory Party will find their Land Bill destroyed by the same arguments by which they and others have destroyed our Land Bill. On the other side of the House, also, you will find dissentient Conservatives. I heard some remarks the other day from that side of the House of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth). He is a generous kind of man. He stated that the working men of England "were prepared to bear a national fine in favour of the landlords in Ireland." That is a grand doctrine. The hon. Member for Salford has long been a respected teacher of the Conservative Party; but they are not all quite obedient pupils. There arose, on those Benches opposite, the hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Addison), and he said that—

"He must claim to represent a working class constituency and the working men of that constituency; and he wished to say that his constituents objected to pay one shilling of English taxation either towards the landlords or the tenants of Ireland."

To the working men of his constituency—

"No measure would be so unpopular as that which saddled the taxation of this country or the industries of this country with any charge whatever for the relief of landlords in Ireland. If the landlords in Ireland were not able to obtain their rents, they would be but in the same position as the unhappy manufacturers in Lancashire and in the North generally, who when they could not get their money were obliged to go without, or do with less. The best way for either the landlord or tenant to get a living was to practise industry and sobriety. . . . . One thing he hoped the Government would not do was to assist the landlords with the money of hard-working Englishmen."

I do not wish in this matter to bind the opinion of any man except myself on this question of the Land Purchase Bill. I have said distinctly that the two questions are separable, and in saying that I believe I express the opinion of my Colleagues. But this opinion I wish to state on my own responsibility—that whatever may be the argument in favour of the Land Purchase Bill, and of changing the system of dual ownership, as it is called, into one of single ownership, I believe that the difficulties which have been created in the way of it, and the arguments used on that side of the House and by Liberal Unionists on that subject, have made it a practical impossibility. I believe it never can receive that support which would be necessary to the dealing with such vast sums of the public money. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham has shown that you cannot confine it to Ireland alone; you must extend those immense grants of public money to Scotland, if to Ireland; you must extend them to the agricultural labourers of England; and if you give an extension of this character to transactions of this kind, you will raise the amount to such a gigantic figure as the nation would never sanction. That is my opinion as to the future of Land Purchase. Then what is the situation in which the Government leave the Irish Question? There are difficulties in the minds of hon. Members which can hardly be denied. The Government have no provision to meet them. They rely on the ordinary law, and, if necessary, they will come for the extraordinary law. They have tried that before; we have tried it before—[*Laughter*]—yes, and it is because we have found that it always failed, that we have determined not to try that method any more, but to seek a new departure and a better way. That policy has failed. I have come to the conclusion that it will always fail. Well, you have come to an opposite conclusion. You have got the power, and you will try the old way. It is our duty to tell you that we believe it will not be successful in the future any more than it has been in the past. You will try your scheme; you have the authority, and with you must rest the responsibility of the future.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It is with great diffidence that I venture to trespass for a short time on the House after the solemn prophecies of the Leader of the "Chosen People." I am encouraged, however, in that course by the recollection that the prototype of the Party which now arrogates to itself the title of the "Chosen People" had to wander for 40 years in the Wilderness; that two of them only ever reached the Promised Land; and that their Leader was not one of those two. Sir, I think that the history of the modern "Chosen People" may possibly be not unlike that of their prototype, if, according to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night, they are to be a Party without any fixed principles of political action. The right hon. Gentleman told us that he was saying nothing new when, alluding to the irreversible verdict of the country at the late Election, he expounded the present policy of what I was going to call the Separatist, but, as that may be insulting, I will call the non-Unionist Party. Sir, there is nothing irreversible about the right hon. Gentleman. There was not a trace of his early manner this evening —of that manner in which he dealt with "the foul conspiracy of the Land League," and alluded to hon. Members who now sit in this House as "preaching the doctrines of treason and assassination." No, Sir, all that is changed; and it is funny to hear the right hon. Gentleman of all men in this House twitting the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) with inconsistency, and comparing himself to Cobden and Bright, the most consistent politicians known in our political history. Well, the right hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham have sat opposite to me for some years past. I have learnt to admire their qualities and their powers. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham is more than a match for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby; but when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby reminds the right hon. Member for West Birmingham of his action with regard to an Amendment to the Address in answer to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne in February last, I am very glad to congratulate the right hon. Member for West Birmingham on his having learnt wisdom by the remarkable consequences that followed from that Amendment, and on having found that the principles he has advocated are more likely to be promoted by not repeating that example. But there is one feature about the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night which is to me very extraordinary, and it is this. We have had two important speeches in the course of this debate from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), the Leader of the non-Unionist Liberals. On the second occasion, the right hon. Gentleman claimed and obtained the indulgence of the House, in order that he might go at full length into the whole policy of Her Majesty's Government; yet not one word did he say as to the announcement which the right hon. Gentleman has made to-night. To-night, for the first time, we learn that the "inseparable" Land Bill, commended by every consideration of honour and every obligation of duty, is now a separable measure from any proposals for Home Rule. Is it that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian shrank from making this announcement himself, and left it to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, as the most reversible of his Colleagues in the late Government? Now, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has dwelt a good deal upon a very valuable Report which has been recently presented by Mr. Tuke. He quoted statements in that Report with regard to some very distressing cases, as if they were really specimens of the state of affairs existing throughout the whole of Ireland, and he asked us what we were going to do on that Report. Well, I am afraid that the right hon. Gentleman has not read the whole of the Report, and I think it was unfair of him not to state to the House that the recommendation with which Mr. Tuke concluded his Report is precisely the same as that which has been undertaken by Her Majesty's Government—namely, that we are going to refuse Home Rule for Ireland, and that we are going to attempt reproductive works, especially in connection with the fisheries and better communications. But the right hon. Gentleman is inquisitive as to our policy. He asks us hypothetical questions as to what we are going to do if the Commission on this Land Question should report in a certain way. Well, Sir, we decline to answer those inquiries just as often as the right hon. Gentleman may choose to make them. We should not have appointed this Commission, if we had been prepared without the inquiry of the Commission to announce our policy. We should be playing with the question; we should be stultifying ourselves, if we were able to state how we should meet the Report of that Commission, without knowing what the Report would be. I have only to say that my noble Friend (Lord Randolph Churchill) and myself differ in no respect on this question from one another. I defy the right hon. Gentleman to find any real difference between our speeches in the House on this matter. My noble Friend and I have stated the policy of Her Majesty's Government on this subject, and at this hour of the morning (12.35) it would be absolutely disrespectful to the House if I attempted to reiterate what has already been said. Of course, I have something to say, and I shall say it as shortly as I can, with respect to the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). I find that one argument runs through all the speeches by which it has been supported, including the speeches delivered on the Front Opposition Bench, and it is this. The inability to pay rent is predicted generally during the coming winter, as if it were solely on account of the fall in the prices of produce. They presume that evictions are likely to occur from this and from no other causes. I confess I question very much the extent of that inability as stated by hon. Members opposite. I do not deny that it does exist, because otherwise Her Majesty's Government would not have appointed a Commission to inquire into it. The hon. Member for the City of Cork seems to take it for granted that the judicial rents were fixed by the Sub-Commissioners at certain rates, without sufficient regard to the late fall in prices, and that those rates were such as to make it impossible to pay those rents at the present price of produce. He adduces no proof whatever in support of this assertion; but an hon. Member who followed him spoke with the authority of his own experience in the matter. The hon. Member told the House that the Sub-Commission, of which he was a Member, had considered the question of the variation of prices, but had not sufficiently considered it; in fact, he admitted that he was wrong when acting as a Sub-Commissioner in supposing that a cycle of good years was going to begin at a very early date. If the hon. Member was wrong once in such a matter, may he not be wrong again? This is what I want to put before the House—that it is by no means proved that the fall in prices is of a permanent character, and even if it were, the prices are not now low enough to make it impossible that the judicial rents generally should be paid. I will quote a statement from a Report which I have lately received from the Land Commissioners on this subject. The hon. Member for South Sligo (Mr.

Sexton) challenged us to show that the Sub-Commissioners, in fixing the rents, left a margin for the fall in prices. Hon. Members will admit that prices from 1881 to 1885 were higher than they are now; and I think it is clear that the Sub-Commissioners generally—whatever may have been the experience of one particular Sub-Commissioner—cannot have fixed the judicial rents on the prices which prevailed then. Up to June 30 of this year, the total amount of judicial rents fixed in Ireland amounted to £2,618,970; while, turning to Griffith's valuation on the same holdings, we find that the amount is £2,447,877, showing a difference of not much more than £170,000 between the judicial rents and Griffith's valuation. Does that not show that the judicial rents, if they were fixed on the prices at all, were fixed on a scale very little above Griffith's valuation? I never heard in Ireland that Griffith's valuation was a high one, except, perhaps, in Ulster. In the South and West of Ireland, to which the hon. Member for the City of Cork's Amendment is particularly addressed, Griffith's valuation is considered very low. [*Cries of* "No!"] Griffith's valuation was fixed on the prices of these articles — wheat, oats, barley, butter, beef, mutton, and pork. The prices of five of these articles were considerably lower at the time of Griffith's valuation than the present prices are. I do not want to weary the House; but, if I am permitted, I will give a few figures which bear on the subject. I find that the price of wheat, quoted in the Act of 1852, on which Griffith's valuation was based, was 7*s.* 6*d.* a cwt. of 112 lbs.; it is now 6*s.* 5*d.* The price of oats was 4*s.* 10*d.* for this weight in 1852; it is now 6*s.* The price of barley was 5*s.* 6*d.* for the same weight; it is now 6*s.* 3*d.* The price of butter was 65*s.* 4*d.* in 1852; it is now 64*s.* 8*d.* The price of beef was 35*s.* 6*d.* in 1852; it is now 52*s.* 6*d.* The price of mutton was 41*s.* in 1852; it is now 56*s.* The price of pork in 1852 was 32*s.*; it is now 48*s.* An hon. Member, speaking from that quarter of the House, told us the other day that potatoes—though they are not included in the produce calculated in Griffith's valuation, they are certainly very important articles of produce—have considerably risen in price between 1878 and 1884. I have obtained these figures from the highest authority—the Valuation Office of Ireland. If these things are so, it is also the fact, as I think everybody knows it is the fact, that the prices of articles of consumption which, at any rate, the better class of farmers in Ireland use, have considerably fallen. The price of labour has risen, yet the small farmers employ very little labour; and, finally, the means of sending produce to market have very much improved in Ireland. I think if all these matters are taken into consideration, the House will hardly believe that there is sufficient ground for the statement of the hon. Member for South Sligo that a crash will come during the next winter, unless something be done to avert it, or that, as a general rule, it is impossible that rents fixed on a valuation evidently very little above Griffith's valuation can be paid by the tenants in Ireland, notwithstanding the prospect of a good harvest which is before them.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House the information he has received from the Land Commission on the subject of the judicial rents outside Ulster—in the Provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught—above the Poor Law valuation?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have not the figures by me; but I quite understand what the hon. Member is alluding to. He is objecting, and I think very fairly, that you must not generalize too much in this matter.

MR. PARNELL: Outside Ulster they are 25 per cent above the Poor Law valuation.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN (Kent, Isle of Thanet): I contradict that flatly.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: What I was seeking to establish by the figures I have quoted is this—that, generally speaking, there cannot be that impossibility to pay the judicial rents in Ireland which has been loudly stated by hon. Members below the Gangway, and which has been supported by the authors of the Land Act sitting on that Bench. I do not at all deny that the judicial rents may possibly be high in particular cases and in particular districts, which are mainly affected by the prices of those articles of produce, such as butter, which have fallen as compared with Griffith's valuation. That is the reason we propose that the Commission shall ascertain, not—as the hon. Member for South Sligo put it—whether prices had exceptionally fallen, but how the operation of the Land Act is affected by that fall in prices; and, without inquiry, I venture to say it is utterly impossible for the House to consider that the question can be fairly dealt with. Of course, we are told by hon. Members below the Gangway that evictions in large numbers will take place during the ensuing winter, on account of inability to pay these judicial rents to which I have alluded. Well, now, Sir, it has already been stated by me, speaking previously on this question, that to say nothing of the remissions which landlords have made in rents, not being judicial rents, and which I do not in the least doubt they would be prepared to make again, the tenant not under a judicial rent can appeal to the Court against a writ of eviction, in order that the execution of that writ may be stayed, until he is able to obtain a fair rent for his holding. The answer that has been given to that statement by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Sir Charles Russell) is that such appeals have been very rare, in consequence of the difficulties that lay in the way of prosecuting them. But the tenants in Ireland find no difficulty in going to the Courts, as has been shown by the working of the Land Act, when left to themselves; and, considering that out of the total number of tenants in Ireland no less than 460,000 would be able to take this course, I cannot see how that danger of unfair eviction could exist in their case which has been so broadly stated by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork. But, then, when I come to leaseholders, or tenants holding under judicial rents, of whom I believe there are about 140,000 in Ireland, I am informed by my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) that even with regard to them the County Courts are empowered by the general order of the Judges to suspend at their discretion the execution of ejectments, and that a similar jurisdiction has been always exercised by the Supreme Court. Of course, I am aware that is only a suspension; but, as far as I gather, that power of suspension is precisely what the hon. Member for the City of Cork, in his own speech, suggested should be given; and, considering that the Courts have this power already, considering that they may, if they choose, exercise it, I am bound to say I cannot see how right hon. Gentlemen opposite can suggest an alteration of the law. As I have said, I do not at all wish to detain the House, and I will only say a few words upon the last paragraph of the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork. Now, the hon. Member has put throughout his whole speech, and throughout his whole Amendment, and so have those who support it, the inability to pay as the sole ground of non-payment of rent in Ireland. Sir, we cannot take that view. We have included in the terms of the Reference to the Commission the duty of inquiring how far the operation of the Land Act is affected, not only by the alteration in prices, but also by the combinations that exist to resist the fulfilment of legal obligations; and I am astonished that in the speeches that have been delivered from that Bench, no allusion, so far as I remember has been, made at all to that which is, to our minds, the most important element in this question. Therefore, Sir, feeling as we do that, if there be non-payment of rent in Ireland during the winter, that non-payment will generally arise, not from inability, but from unwillingness to pay, unwillingness, perhaps, easily fortified by a little terrorism, or due entirely to terrorism — if that be so, obviously we cannot accept the interpretation which the hon. Member for the City of Cork places, I suppose, on the third paragraph of his Amendment. That paragraph seems to us to be based on an entirely unwarrantable assumption. If non-payment of rent is due to combination and unwillingness, what would be more unjust than that the landlords of Ireland should be fined on account of non-payment due to these causes? Sir, we have put forward, as the ultimate object of this Commission and of our land policy, the extension of the present system of converting occupiers in Ireland into owners. I was sorry to hear the mode in which that matter was treated by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) to-night. I confess I had thought, until I heard his speech, that the whole House was practically agreed in sympathy with that object, provided it could be carried out with fairness to owners of land, to the occupiers of land, and to the taxpayers of the country. Well, the hon. Member for South Sligo told us that the Land Purchase Bill of the late Government, which is now dead, which is separated from their Home Rule proposal, in his opinion did not involve the slightest risk to the country, although, at the same time, he was strongly supporting this Amendment, which says that many tenants will be unable, on account of poverty, to pay their rents. What was the hon. Gentleman's reason for such an assertion? He said that he and his Friends had reason to believe that the 20 years named in the Bill as the number of years' purchase would be in some remarkable way whittled down in operation. I should like to know his reason for thinking so; because it seems to me almost an insult to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) to suggest, as I think the hon. Member for South Sligo did, that he had put before Parliament a Bill apparently giving to landlords in Ireland 20 years' purchase for their estates, intending, at the same time, to appoint a Commission to whittle it down practically to nothing. Well, I am bound to admit that, so far as my opinion goes, there must be some risk in any scheme of Land Purchase in Ireland. It may be that there must be some loss to the State in effecting it. We wait to deal with that question until we are furnished with the facts, until we have the suggestions of the Commission, until we are able to make up our own minds on those subjects; and all I will say now is this — that we shall approach the consideration of the question, I believe, in ample time to legislate next Session in regard to it, with the determination of doing justice to all interests affected, including that of the British taxpayer, in whose behalf hon. Members opposite are so remarkably anxious. Sir, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Sir Charles Russell) twitted us the other evening with not being supported in our policy by the great majority of the Irish Members. Well, Sir, we may not be supported by them at present. Perhaps, when our policy on the question of land is developed, when practical proposals are laid before the House, we may be more fortunate in that respect; but I think it is strange that this taunt should come from an hon. and learned Gentleman who was a Member of the late Government, who, a very few months ago, specially reserved this dealing with the Land Question for the Imperial Parliament, and would not allow the Irish Representatives in Dublin to deal with it themselves. Why, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne has stated more plainly than any of his Colleagues the necessity for dealing with the Irish Land Question in the Imperial Parliament. He stated, if I remember right, that that necessity was due to the position of the landlords in Ireland, and to the mode in which Parliament had heretofore dealt with them; and I think he intimated very clearly his belief that, owing to the opinions held by hon. Members below the Gangway on the subject of the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland, there would be great danger of injustice to the landlords, if the Land Question were left to be settled by an Irish Parliament; and yet an hon. and learned Gentleman, who is himself responsible for that policy, taunts us because, in its initiation, our policy does not command the support of hon. Members below the Gangway. Sir, there is one question which was asked by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and which was not answered in the speech of the hon. Member for South Sligo to-night. [*Cries of* "Belfast!"] Why was it that, pending the consideration by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian of the question of Home Rule for Ireland, pending the consideration of his measures by Parliament and by the country, we heard nothing whatever, either in this House, or, so far as I know, in the country, of this condition of the Irish farmers, which is now brought before us as so terrible and so urgent that we are to deal with it by what amounts to a complete reversal of the Land Act, without even any previous inquiry? Prices were lower as regards stock during the earlier months of 1886 than they are now, and yet I believe the spring and summer rents in Ireland were fairly paid, and why were they fairly paid? Because the pressure which prevented their payment was withdrawn. The hon. Member for South Sligo said, to-night, that the National League advised the tenants to pay the utmost rent they were able to pay. Another hon. Member said they denied there was any conspiracy against the judicial rents, and that not a single Member sitting in that quarter of the House would encourage the tenants in such a policy. Well, Sir, I wish those doctrines were promulgated a little more throughout Ireland. The House will remember the witty suggestion made a long time ago, when the Government of this country appointed Bishops to the Established Church of Ireland, that very admirable and religious men were selected by the Ministers of the day, but that when these men set out on their journey to Ireland they were waylaid on Hounslow Heath by highwaymen, who robbed them of their credentials and obtained installation in their place. I am almost afraid that the difficulty of communication with Ireland which then was felt must exist in some mysterious fashion still, so that the counsels of patience and moderation, and fulfilment where possible of legal obligations, which I have no doubt are given by hon. Members with perfect sincerity, change their nature before they reach the wilds of Connaught. I may be wrong, but reports have reached me, from which it would seem that there must be individuals, almost at the present time, making speeches in the South and West of Ireland, masquerading under the names of hon. Members of this House, who, when they sit here, are perfectly Constitutional and loyal. I agree with the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork that there is a gloomy prospect before us; but I differ from him absolutely as to the reason. He and the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Sligo dwelt on the great advantage to their Party which has been gained by the association with them, and the enrolment under their banner, of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian and his followers in Great Britain. They went on to anticipate that, before long, that support would be increased, and would bring them success in that which is the great object of their desires. I think, for my own part, that the anticipations of the hon. Members and their Friends in this respect are not likely to be realized. I believe, with my right hon. Friend the Member for Dartford, that the more the people of Great Britain understand what is meant by a separate Government and Parliament for Ireland, the less they will like it. But the hon. Members may be right. It is possible that by Constitutional means the Irish Home Rule Party may convince the reason of the people of Great Britain; but, Sir, one thing I will venture to say, and that is, that the people of Great Britain never will be coerced by a "no rent campaign," backed by intimidation, into conceding to Ireland anything but that which their reason and judgment tell them is right.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 181; Noes 304: Majority 123.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Glam.)
Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Acland, A. H. D.
Acland, C. T. D.
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Asher, A.
Asquith, H. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Barran, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blane, A.
Borlase, W. C.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, Jacob
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Burt, T.
Buxton, S. C.
Byrne, G. M.
Cameron, J. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Chance, P. A.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Cobb, H. P.
Coleridge, hon. B.
Commins, A.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly, L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Craven, J.
Crawford, D.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Crilly, D.
Dillon, J.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. G.
Esslemont, P.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fenwick, C.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro-
Finucane, J.
Flower, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Forster, Sir C.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Fuller, G. P.
Gane, J. L.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gill, T. P.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Gray, E. D.
Grove, Sir T. F.
Harrington, E.
Harrington, T. C.
Harris, M.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.

Hooper, J.
Howell, G.
Hunter, W. A.
Jacoby, J. A.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, C. S.
Kenny, J. E.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lacaita, C. C.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lawson, H. L. W.
Leahy, J.
Leamy, E.
Lefevre, rt. hon. G. S.
Lewis, T. P.
Lockwood, F.
Lyell, L.
M'Arthur, W. A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Carthy, J. H.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, Dr. R.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Mappin, F. T.
Marum, E. M.
Mason, S.
Mayne, T.
Molloy, B. C.
Morgan, O. V.
Morley, rt. hon. J.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Kerry)
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Doherty, J. E.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Pease, A. E.
Pickard, B.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Plowden, Sir W. C.
Portman, hon. E. B.
Potter, T. B.
Power, P. J.
Power, R.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Reynolds, W. J.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Roberts, J. B.
Roe, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rountree, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Russell, E. R.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Sheil, E.
Shirley, W. S.
Simon, Sir J.
Smith, S.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stepney - Cowell, Sir A. K.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Tuite, J.
Waddy, S. D.
Wallace, R.
Warmington, C. M.
Watson, T.
Watt, H.
Will, J. S.
Williams, A. J.
Williamson, J.
Wilson, H. J.
Wright, C.
Yeo, F. A.

TELLERS.

Illingworth, A.
Parnell, C. S.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baillie-Cochrane, hon. C. W. A. N.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Baring, Viscount
Barnes, A.
Bartley, G. C. T.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, H.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beach, W. W. B.
Beadel, W. J.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Biddulph, M.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Bruce, Lord H.
Buchanan, T. R.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chamberlain, R.
Chaplin, right hon. H.
Charrington, S.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Collings, J.
Commerell, Adml. Sir J. E.
Compton, F.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Coope, O. E.
Corbett, A. C.
Corbett, J.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Courtney, L. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Cubitt, right hon. G.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon G.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elliot, G. W.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Farquharson, H. R.
Feilden, Lt.-Gen. R. J.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Finlay, R. B.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitz-Wygram, General Sir F. W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fry, L.
Fulton, J. F.
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Greenall, Sir G.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Grotrian, F. B.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hall, A. W.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Lord E.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Hardcastle, E.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hastings, G. W.
Havelock - Allan, Sir H. M.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Herbert, hon. S.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hill, A. S.
Hingley, B.
Hoare, S.
Hodge, R. T. H.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Howard, J.

Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, rt. hn. J. G.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir W. G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenrick, W.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Ker, R. W. B.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, hon. H. T.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, L.
Kynoch, G.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lea, T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Lethbridge, Sir R.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
Mallock, R.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mills, hon. C. W.
More, R. J.
Morgan, hon. F.
Morrison, W.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Murdoch, C. T.
Newark, Viscount
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Pitt-Lewis, G.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Powell, F. S.
Price, Captain G. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Reed, H. B.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Round, J.
Royden, T. B.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Smith, D.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Stewart, M. J.
Sutherland, T.
Swetenham, E.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K
Taylor, F.
Temple, Sir R.
Theobald, J.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Verdin, R.
Vernon, hon. G. R.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watkin, Sir E. W.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
Weymouth, Viscount
Wharton, J. L.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wiggin, H.
Williams, J. Powell-
Wilson, Sir S.
Winn, hon. R.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Yerburgh, R. A.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. S. Smith,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till *Monday* next.—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

House adjourned at half after One o'clock till Monday next.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 30*th August,* 1886.

MINUTES.] — PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS — *First Reading*—Local Government (County Divisions) * (167); Local Government (Highways) * (168); Local Government (No. 3) * (170); Local Government (No. 5) * (172); Local Government (No. 6) * (190); Local Government (No. 7) * (3); Local Government (No. 8) * (4); Local Government (No. 9) * (5); Local Government (No. 10) * (6); Local Government (No. 11) * (7); Local Government (Poor Law) (No. 7) * (169); Local Government (Gas) * (189); Pier and Harbour * (191); Tramways (No. 1) * (192); Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2) * (8).

First and Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading — Elementary Education Confirmation (Birmingham) * (96); Elementary Education Confirmation (London) * (97), and *passed.*

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

QUEEN'S SPEECH — HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of MOUNT-EDGCUMBE) reported Her Majesty's Answer to the Address as follows:—

MY LORDS,

"YOUR loyal and dutiful Address affords Me much satisfaction.

"I rely with confidence on your cordial co-operation in such measures as may be submitted to you for the conduct of the public service during the remaining portion of the financia year."

INDIA (BOMBAY)—THE SIRDAR PRITHI RAO.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, he rose to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether he would inquire into the circumstances of the reversing by the late Secretary of State for India of the decision of the Bombay Government in favour of Sirdar Prithi Rao, with the view either of reinstating Sirdar Prithi Rao in his zemindary, or of allowing him to bring his case before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or of granting him compensation for his removal from the succession to his late brother's property by the late Secretary of State? The last owner of the estate of the Himmet Bahadur family, Ranoji Rao, died August 13, 1877. His widow applied to the Bombay Government for leave to adopt an heir to her late husband, and the Political Agent supported her application, but proposed that her choice should be limited to a son of Prithi Rao, her late husband's brother. The Bombay Government, in a Resolution of December 7, 1877, approved of this proposal, and added that should Prithi Rao decline to give a son for the purpose further reference should be made to the Government. In May, 1878, Prithi Rao submitted a Memorial to the Bombay Government with proofs of his being entitled to succeed to the ancestral zemindary to the exclusion of an adopted son. On full consideration, the Bombay Government affirmed Prithi Rao's right to succeed to the estate by a Resolution dated August 15, 1878. Radhabhai, the widow, countenanced by the Karbhari, or Minister of Kolhapur, a Brahmin, appealed to the Secretary of State against this decision, and the Secretary of State reversed the decision of the Bombay Government, and allowed the widow of the late zemindar to adopt a son unconditionally, by a decision dated May 27, 1880, and confirmed by a despatch of December 23, 1880, of the Secretary of State. He now complained of the conduct of the India Office on three grounds—first, their decision was contrary to Hindoo law; secondly, the India Office or the Secretary of State were morally incompetent to decide upon succession to property dependent on Hindoo law, which should have been decided judicially; thirdly, in dispossessing Prithi Rao no reasons were given to him for the taking away of his rank and property. He would not trouble the House with details of the Hindoo law with regard to adoption, beyond observing that the Bengal school of interpretation was more lax and more favourable to a widow than that of Maharastra. That a brother should succeed a brother who left no children in the case of a State or of an impartible estate carrying the rank of a Sirdar with it was shown in the case of the Gaekwar of Baroda and the succession of the three brothers Gunput Rao, Khunde Rao, and Mulhar Rao to the Gadi of Baroda. Besides, if the India Office had any sound legal ground for their decision which disinherited Sirdar Prithi Rao, why did they refuse to lay it on the Table of the House or even to let it be seen? Prithi Rao has cited the opinions and decisions in his favour of Sir George Clerk, formerly Governor of Bombay, and Sir George Clerk had confirmed to him that his opinion was such as quoted by Prithi Rao. In the next place, how could the India Office take upon itself to decide a question of Hindoo law in opposition to the Bombay Government, which had the advantage of competent interpreters of that law close at hand? Why had it assumed to decide arbitrarily a question of property, which could only be be decided in a satisfactory manner by a judicial hearing? Why did the Secretary of State not request the Chief Justice of Bombay to hear this case, and name two assessors to hear it with him, or else leave it to the Chief Justice to name his assessors? Or why did he not take advantage of the Statute of William IV., and remit the case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? The Secretary of State had been reminded of this in time if it was true, as was stated in the papers he had received, that the Government of Sir James Fergusson had urged on the Secretary of State that this question was one of exact right, and that the appellant had a legal title to succeed, and that they proposed that the question might be left to the arbitrament of a Judge of the High Court. His third ground of complaint was that, although this question depended entirely on legal issues, Sirdar Prithi Rao had been dispossessed of his rank and property without any reason for it being assigned. It was not till he (Lord Stanley of Alderley) had begun to move in the matter that a letter was written on the 20th of April last to Prithi Rao by the Political Agent, Mr. Lee Warner, professing to give the grounds for the Secretary of State's decision of May 27, 1880. This letter, as an exposition of legal matters, is eminently unsatisfactory, and entirely of a *sic volo sic jubeo* tenour. The Secretary of State said in this letter—

> "If, as shown by Radhabhai's petition of July 1, 1878, and the Karbhari's report of November 13, 1877, it is possible to get for adoption any other fit boy of the family, I see no just reason for prescribing the selection of any certain boy in any certain manner."

No one at all; except that Hindoo law prescribed a certain boy and required the consent of the kinsmen. The noble Lord, in conclusion, asked the Question of which Notice had been given.

THE PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of SALISBURY): My noble Friend the Secretary of State for India is not a Member of the House, and is, therefore, unable to answer the Question of my noble Friend at the Table. By his wish, I answer it with such lights as I can. There are in the Bombay Presidency a certain number of petty Chieftaincies, of which the rights are decided, not by Courts of Law, but by political authorities; and any appeal from the political authorities is necessarily to the Secretary of State, who decides in Council in the last resort. This is a case of succession depending upon the intricacies of the Hindoo Law of Adoption. With respect to the case itself, I am sorry that I cannot hold out to my noble Friend any hope that it will be re-opened. Whether the present mode of disposing of such cases is the best possible or not, it would be very undesirable that we should depart from the usual law and practice in such matters in any one individual case alone. The worst possible tribunal for re-opening these cases would be this House or the other House of Parliament. My noble Friend wanders with ease through all the mazes of Hindoo law; but we are not most of us similarly qualified to discuss the case, and we should, I am afraid, come to nothing but a very foolish decision. Whether the mode of dealing with these cases is the best possible is a matter which I quite admit is open to discussion. I do not think it would be desirable to send them to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Whether it would be possible to have any machinery in India somewhat after the fashion of that tribunal, without referring these cases to the Secretary of State for India, is, I think, a matter which may be fairly discussed; but it should be discussed on general grounds, and not with reference to any one individual case. I do not wish to express any opinion upon this subject. I am not competent to do so. It is a matter which my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India, when he comes into the House, can discuss with my noble Friend who put the Question. But I fear that, whatever we do with respect to the general law, we cannot possibly depart from it in this individual case.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 30th August, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — Selection, Lord Edward Cavendish *disch.;* Sir H. H. Vivian and Sir Robert N. Fowler *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Secret Service (Repeal) * [41]; Trust Funds (Railways) * [42].

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS — *Read first and second time*—Elementary Education Confirmation (Birmingham) * [272]; Elementary Education Confirmation (London) * [273].

Report—Considered as amended—Third Reading —Local Government (No. 7) * [256]; Local Government (No. 8) * [262]; Local Government (No. 10) * [269], and *passed.*

Report — Third Reading — Local Government (No. 9) * [263]; Local Government (No. 11) * [277]; Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2) * [261], and *passed.*

Second Reading—Electric Lighting * [278].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—COMMITTEE OF SELECTION.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do consist of Nine Members.

Ordered, That Lord EDWARD CAVENDISH be discharged.

Ordered, That Sir H. H. VIVIAN and Sir ROBERT N. FOWLER be added to the Committee.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

QUESTIONS.

BOARD OF TRADE—HARBOUR LOANS.

MR. C. T. D. ACLAND (Cornwall, Launceston) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If he is in a position to state in what form additional facilities are to be offered for the increase or improvement of harbour accommodation by localities willing and able to give the requisite security for interest and repayment of loans of public money?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth), in reply, said, he was not yet in a position to state what additional facilities could be offered; but if the hon. Gentleman would communicate with him privately he would be happy to see what could be done.

MR. MARJORIBANKS (Berwick) gave Notice that he would next Session draw attention to the want of deep-water harbours on the coasts of England and Scotland, and move that a sum not less than that spent on harbours in Ireland should be expended in providing additional harbour accommodation for those countries.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTES.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will be good enough to inform the House the nature of the negotiations in which Her Majesty's Government are engaged with a view to a settlement of the United States and Canadian fishery disputes; and, whether he can, before the rising of Parliament, place upon the Table of the House the Correspondence of the several Governments interested?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): In addition to the negotiations which are going on in America, the Secretary of State is in personal as well as in official communication with the United States Minister. It would be unsatisfactory and undesirable to present to Parliament Correspondence which is in progress.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—HEAD CONSTABLE MAGEE.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If head constable Magee will still be retained at Armagh, notwithstanding that his relations by marriage reside in Thomas Street, Armagh; and, if the usual rule of the constabulary applies in this case?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I am informed that the rule referred to in the Question is frequently relaxed when the relationship is so distant as not to interfere with the proper and impartial discharge of duty. This is the case as regards Head Constable Magee; and, therefore, it is not intended to transfer him from Armagh.

RAILWAY RATES—LEGISLATION.

MR. BADEN-POWELL (Liverpool, Kirkdale) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether he can give the House any information as to the intentions of the Government with respect to the introduction of a Bill dealing with Railway Rates?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Yes, Sir; the Board of Trade hope to be in a position to deal with the subject next Session.

EDUCATION — SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION IN THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID (St. Pancras, S.) asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, inasmuch as Board Schools in some of the metropolitan districts, are in the habit of receiving children from areas beyond those in which the schools are placed, the consequence being that such schools are not available for the children of parents living within such areas, instructions will be given that when school accommodation becomes urgently required for any particular district, the school in such district shall no longer be available for children of parents living at a distance?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The Education Department have no power to give any general directions as to the course to be followed by the London School Board in the matter referred to; but I may state for the information of the hon. Member that any parent who deems himself aggrieved by the exclusion of his child from a Board School can bring the case before the Department under Article 89 of the Code, and the School Board in question would be communicated with.

BURIALS (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE CHURCHYARD AT BOLTON-ON-DEARNE, YORKSHIRE.

Mr. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it has been proved to the satisfaction of an inspector specially sent down from the Home Office to examine into the matter, that the churchyard at Bolton on Dearne in Yorkshire is, and has been for a long time, quite full of bodies; and, if so, why it has been decided that the said churchyard shall not be closed till September, 1887; and, where it is intended to bury persons who may die during the next twelve months?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir; I am informed by the Inspector that he is satisfied, from a recent inspection, that this churchyard is nearly full; but there is still a narrow strip of ground available for burials, and, moreover, it is anticipated that there will be unusual difficulty in finding a suitable site for a new burial ground. Under these circumstances, the Inspector is of opinion that the existing ground should remain open for another year; and with this opinion, I am told, the Medical Officer of Health for the district fully concurs. In the meantime, should the necessity arise, there will be no difficulty in finding burial room in neighbouring churchyards.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS)—SWINE FEVER—INOCULATION.

Sir RICHARD PAGET (Somerset, Wells) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he will be good enough to inform the House what progress has been made in the scientific investigations by the Veterinary Staff of the Agricultural Department of the Privy Council with regard to inoculation with attenuated virus in cases of swine fever, which were ordered to be commenced in the month of May last; and, if he is able to state when the Report of Professor Brown on Swine Fever, presented to Parliament on 24th June last, will be delivered to Members?

The CHANCELLOR of the DUCHY (Lord John Manners) (Leicestershire, E.): The scientific investigations by the veterinary staff of the Agricultural Department of the Privy Council with regard to inoculation with attenuated virus in cases of swine fever have not yet been commenced in consequence of the difficulty experienced in obtaining suitable premises (which have to be registered under the Act 39 and 40 *Vict.* c. 77) in which the investigations can be carried on, and in obtaining the necessary licence for the performance of the experiments on living animals. The Report of Professor Brown on swine fever, presented to Parliament on the 24th of June last, is in the hands of the printer, and will shortly be issued. The Department is in communication with the Home Office with the view of obtaining the necessary sanction to complete the investigations.

FINANCE, &c.—IMPERIAL TAXATION ON REAL AND REALIZED PERSONAL PROPERTY.

Sir RICHARD PAGET (Somerset, Wells) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he will be good enough to take steps to secure the early publication of the Return of "Imperial Taxation on Real and Realised Personal Property," ordered by the House to be printed so long since as the 12th day of August 1885, and which Return has not yet been circulated?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I think I can safely promise my hon. Friend that this Return will be ready for publication in the course of next week.

FINANCE, &c.—TAXATION ON PERSONAL PROPERTY IN FRANCE, &c.

Sir RICHARD PAGET (Somerset, Wells) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the information as to existing methods of taxation of personal property in France, Germany, and the United States, applied for in April last, has been furnished by Her Majesty's Representatives; and, whether he will be good enough to lay such information, when received, upon the Table of the House in the form of separate Returns, dealing solely with the special subject-matter of this inquiry?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Reports from France and the United States have been received, and are being printed. The Report from Germany is expected in a few days, and it is hoped that the Papers which will be laid upon the Table forthwith will be ready for distribution in about a fortnight.

FRANCE—SUMMARY REMOVAL OF REV. W. J. DROUGHT.

MR. J. G. TALBOT (Oxford University) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the statement of the Rev. W. J. Drought is correct that he has been summarily removed from his Chaplaincy in France, in consequence of his having taken part in an Address to members of the late Royal Family; and, whether Her Majesty's Government propose to address any remonstrance to the French Government on the subject?

MR. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee) said, that before the Question was answered he wished to know whether it was not the case that the address referred to described the Duc d'Aumale as "His Royal Highness" and spoke of "His Royal House;" whether, as a matter of fact, the Duc d'Aumale had not been expelled from France for disloyalty to his country; whether the Address expressed a hope for his restoration; and, whether Her Majesty's Government approved of British subjects taking part by means of such manifestoes against a friendly Government?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Rev. Mr. Drought's complaint was only received by the Secretary of State on Saturday last. It is receiving his attention; but some days at least must elapse before I shall be in a position to give a definite reply to the Question of my hon. Friend. In reply to the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Robertson), I would submit to him that it would be prudent not to enter into the details of the matter in present circumstances.

PUBLIC HEALTH—RIVER POLLUTION —THE RIVER CHESS, HERTS.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the continued pollution of the River Chess by refuse from the Loudwater Paper Mills, resulting in a nuisance highly dangerous to the inhabitants of Rickmansworth and the district; whether he is aware that, after a long inquiry, a Report was made upon it on 14th July 1885 by Mr. J. T. Harrison, C.E., the Special Inspector appointed by the Local Government Board, and proceedings were taken against the owner, Mr. M'Murray, by the Watford Union Rural Sanitary Board; whether penalty and costs were enforced against Mr. M'Murray; and, whether, as many complaints have been made to the Local Sanitary Authority and the Local Government Board of the daily pollution of the river, he will give instructions for the enforcement of further penalties under "The Rivers Pollution Prevention Act, 1875," or for the repression of the nuisance?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I am aware that an inquiry was held into this matter by consent of the Local Government Board in September last. The result of that inquiry was that the Sanitary Authority proceeded against Mr. M'Murray, and an order prohibiting him from polluting the river was obtained. The costs, amounting to £86 13*s.* 2*d.*, were paid by Mr. M'Murray. Since that time more than one complaint has been received by the Local Government Board to the effect that the nuisance still continues, and the attention of the Rural Sanitary Board has been called to these complaints. They state that, owing partly to proceedings in lunacy which are pending in regard to Mr. M'Murray, no further legal steps have been taken; but that, on the whole, the condition of the river has, undoubtedly, been better since the order of September last. I cannot say that I am satisfied with the position in which the matter stands; but I must point out that the Local Government Board have no power to initiate proceedings. They can only give their consent to proceedings being instituted. I have, however, called upon the Rural Sanitary Authority to cause their Inspector of Nuisances or Medical Officer of Health to report without delay upon the condition of the river, and to furnish a copy of the Report to the Local Government Board

ROYAL COMMISSION ON TRADE AND AGRICULTURE—FOREIGN BOUNTIES.

MR. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the investigations of the Royal Commission on Trade have resulted in the suggestion of any means for the removal of various inequalities which exist, to the detriment of British industries; and, whether steps will be taken to mitigate the injury which Trade and Agriculture, both in this Country and the Colonies, are suffering from in consequence of the system of bounties granted by Foreign Powers, especially in the importation during 1885 of 700,000 tons of bounty-aided sugars, valued at ten millions sterling, and the unfair advantages afforded to foreign owners and shipbuilders by the payment of bounties upon foreign shipping?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I hope the hon. Member will excuse my saying that it is my distinct opinion that, in respect to the first part of this Question, it is quite in his power to give as valuable and weighty a reply to it as it is in mine. He has only to read the three Reports of the Royal Commission, and, if he does so, I think he will find that the Commissioners have not made any suggestions in the direction which apparently he would wish them to take. In the third Report the Commissioners expressly state that they are not in a position to make a final Report on any of the matters in question. With regard to the second Question of the hon. Member, of course the Government are well aware that the manufacturing interests in connection with the sugar question in this country have suffered injury from the operation of foreign bounties; but we are not in a position to state whether it is in our power, in any degree, to mitigate that injury. Of course, the hon. Member will understand that the Government must also take into consideration in connection with this question the interests of the consumer. I have never yet heard it alleged that the interests of the consumer are injuriously affected by the operation of these foreign bounties; but I may add that it is at the present moment under the consideration of the Government whether they could advantageously re-open negotiations with Foreign Governments as to the general operation of the bounty system upon the manufacture of sugar.

INLAND REVENUE—REPAYMENT OF INCOME TAX.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has considered the printed circular lately issued by the Board of Inland Revenue, from which it would appear that persons not liable to Income Tax, but compelled to pay it, are not to be permitted to claim repayment until after the 5th April next; and, whether he can see his way to remedy this grievance?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I have inquired into this matter, and I find the rule laid down in the Circular referred to is necessary. Of course, it is only after the close of the financial year that the claim of any individual to exemption can be examined, for it is only at the end of the year that it can be beyond doubt. As to the second Question of the hon. Member, any alternative to the present system would entail an immense increase of labour on the staff, as the claims to repayment number 118,000. Although I cannot give the hon. Member any assurance that the general operation of the rule can be modified, at the same time, if any exceptional cases arise, I should advise him to communicate directly with the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and I do not doubt that any recommendation he makes will be carefully attended to.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—RE-OPENING OF WESTMINSTER HALL.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the First Commissioner of Works, When it is intended that Westminster Hall should be again opened to the public; and, whether it is first to be redecorated; and, if so, when that work will be commenced and when it is expected to be completed?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): Westminster Hall was closed and has been kept closed by the advice of the Home Office, and my right hon. Friend the present Home Secretary informs me that he cannot at present sanction any departure from the existing regulations

The question of redecorating the Hall has not, so far as I am aware, been under consideration.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—HEAVY GUNS.

Sir **HENRY TYLER** (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any, and, if so, what, steps are now being taken with a view to the design and manufacture of guns of large calibre, which can be considered reliable when employed in active service and fired without fear of failure with service charges, so as to enable the Admiralty to construct ships, and the Royal Engineers to build forts, intended for use with such guns?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): The Question of the hon. Gentleman appears to me to suggest that he is unaware that there is an experimental establishment at Shoeburyness, and that officers of the Army and Navy, assisted by eminent civilians, are specially charged with the duties to which he points; but I suggest to my hon. Friend that the importance of the subject renders it desirable that it should be dealt with with the gravity it deserves in a serious discussion on the Estimates, which I hope we may reach in a few days, rather than by an answer to a Question, which cannot be full or complete.

ADMIRALTY—MEDALS OF THE SAILORS AND NAVAL OFFICERS IN THE EGYPTIAN AND SOUDAN CAMPAIGNS.

Mr. **EDWIN DE LISLE** (Leicestershire, Mid) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, When the medals and clasps due to the sailors and Naval officers who served in the late Egyptian and Soudan Campaigns, or in the case of those who did not survive to their relatives, are likely to be distributed, seeing that the same medals due to soldiers and officers of the Army have been distributed more than a year ago?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): The medals were advertised in *The London Gazette* of May 28 last as ready for distribution, and the greater portion of them have since been issued. Applications have been called for, and are attended to immediately on receipt. It may be observed that there is greater difficulty in obtaining the necessary information for the preparation of the Naval medal rolls as compared with those for the Army.

TRADE MARKS—FALSE MARKING AND WRAPPING—LEGISLATION.

Mr. **HOWARD VINCENT** (Sheffield, Central) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If that Department has come to a decision as to the necessity of fresh legislation in greater restraint of the false marking and deceptive wrapping of goods sold in the United Kingdom, for the more effectual protection of British industry against foreign competition; and, in such case, if a Bill will be introduced early in the ensuing Session providing for the necessary changes in the Law?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Board of Trade hope to have an opportunity of introducing next Session a measure to deal with the matters referred to.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—LOUGH ERNE.

Mr. **JORDAN** (Clare, W.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If the drainage of Lough Erne with its tributaries and the Ulster and Ballinamore Canals, so intimately connected therewith, will be referred to the proposed Commission on the development of Irish resources?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I have no information myself on this subject; and I regret, therefore, that I cannot give any to the hon. Member.

SOUTH AFRICA—PONDOLAND—THE PONDOS.

Mr. **DILLWYN** (Swansea Town) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Pondos have recently submitted to Her Majesty's High Commissioner at the Cape proposals for the settlement of all their differences with the Government of the Cape Colony; whether they have offered, if necessary, to refer certain questions to arbitration; and, what steps Sir Hercules Robinson has taken to arrive at an understanding with the authorities of Pondoland?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle):

The proposals for the settlement of the differences with the Pondos were, in fact, claims for the St. John's River country and for the control of the Xesibes or their country. These could not be entertained, as both of these countries have already been a part of the Cape Colony, and, indeed, the abandonment of the Xesibes after the promises made to them would have been impossible. Her Majesty's Government do not know of any offer to go to "arbitration"—a term hardly applicable to South African Native territories under the supervision of the High Commissioner. But they are always ready to consider the representations of the Pondos, through the High Commissioner. As their claim cannot be entertained Sir Hercules Robinson has, with the concurrence of the Cape Government, offered to consider with the Pondos whether they should have money compensation for any losses they may have sustained by the Proclamation of 1878. They have hitherto refused to negotiate on this basis; but it is hoped that they and their European advisers may eventually entertain this offer.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (ENGLAND AND WALES)—REMOVAL OF CHRIST'S HOSPITAL.

MR. BONSOR (Surrey, Wimbledon) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is true, as reported, that the Treasurer of Christ's Hospital, in giving evidence last month before Mr. Clutton in the General Post Office Compensation Case—

> "Spoke to the necessity of having residence for the masters in the immediate neighbourhood (of St. Martin's le Grand). The Governors had discussed the question of removing the school, and decided not to remove it;"

and, if this report is correct, what effect will be given to the unanimous Report of the Royal Commissioners in 1877, that—

> "For a thorough reform in the management and discipline of the school, we think that its removal from London is indispensable,"

and to the scheme of the Charity Commissioners, lately issued, which endorses such view, and, after examination of the funds, proposes that nearly if not quite double the number of children should be forthwith benefited?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): I have no information as to the statement attributed to the Treasurer of Christ's Hospital; but the scheme of the Charity Commissioners, providing for the removal into the country of the existing school, as well as the establishment of other schools in London, has not been abandoned, and is now under the consideration of the Education Department.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CULDAFF SALMON FISHERY PIER.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether his attention has been drawn to the evidence given during the recent fishery inquiries in Innishowen by Mr. R. M. Fleming, the lessee of the Culdaff Salmon Fishery, with reference to the pier lately constructed at Culdaff, viz.—

> "That it is of no benefit to anyone; that it is not suitable for even the smallest description of boat, as it is so arranged that if you wish to land you have first to get out of the boat and wade ashore; that no provision in the way of a boat-slip has been made, and the boats cannot be left in the dock over six hours without being broken to pieces by the rise and fall of the tide. Altogether it has been about as useless an expenditure of public money as could possibly be imagined;"

whether the Commissioners inspected the pier, and agreed with the complaints put forward against it; whether four thousand pounds have been expended on it; whether this pier was constructed under the Board of Works; and, whether it is to the same authority that the Government propose to entrust the works which the proposed Royal Commission are intended to recommend?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I have made inquiries about this case, and I am informed that the pier named was constructed under the Board of Works, who acted on instructions from the Fishery Pier and Harbour Commissioners. These Commissioners instructed the Board to make a pier at a cost not exceeding £4,000. The plans made by the Board were submitted to, and approved by, the Fishery Pier and Harbour Commissioners; but the limit of £4,000 was probably insufficient to enable the pier to be made as long as was desirable it should be. No complaint, so far as I know, has been made as to the quality of the work, nor of any departure from the plans approved by the Fishery Commissioners. No responsibility, therefore, attaches to the Board of Works in the matter. The latter part of the Question I am unable to answer.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask if the allegations in the Question with regard to the fishery pier are correct; and if the Board of Works are prepared to supplement the existing structure so as to render it useful?

Mr. JACKSON said, the hon. Member knew, as well as anybody, that the Board of Works had no control over the Fishery Pier and Harbour Commissioners. They could only spend such a sum of money upon the works as was placed at their disposal. There was no objection to enlarge the pier if the Commissioners approved of it.

MARRIAGES (ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS).

Mr. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the purpose of dispensing with the presence of the registrar at marriages in Nonconformist Chapels; and, if not, whether he intends to reintroduce his Bill of the last Parliament, or to take any effective steps to secure the settlement of the question in a manner satisfactory to the Nonconformists of the Country?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): Her Majesty's Government hope to be able to introduce, early next Session, a Bill to deal with the question of the attendance of Registrars of Marriages in Nonconformist chapels.

FIRES (METROPOLIS)—FIRE AT MILLWALL.

Sir EDWARD WATKIN (Hythe) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the destructive fire at a petroleum wharf at Millwall last week; whether he is aware that, but for a fortunate change of wind, the overground tanks near the River would have been destroyed, causing the escape of many thousand gallons of burning oil into the River Thames, and probably leading to an unparalleled conflagration; whether he is aware that at another petroleum wharf, in a densely populated part of the East End of London, there is, at the present moment, about three millions of gallons of petroleum, the bulk of which is lying in barrels in the open air, protected from the sun and from fire by wicker hurdles only; and, what steps he proposes to take for the safe storage of petroleum?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir; my attention has been drawn to this fire; but I am advised that the proprietor of the wharf had caused the tanks to be surrounded by an efficient containing wall and embankment, so that it would have been impossible for any escape of burning oil to have taken place into the Thames, even if all the tanks referred to in the Question had been destroyed and their contents had been liberated. In reply to the second part of the Question, I have to say that I have caused inquiries to be made, and I am informed that the only wharf to which the Question can apparently apply is one in which it is true the greater part of the storage takes place in barrels in the open. Nevertheless, the whole area over which the storage extends is completely surrounded by a brick and concrete wall and earth embankment, which forms an efficient reservoir of a capacity largely in excess of the aggregate quantity of mineral oil stored there. Lastly, I have to say that the law with regard to mineral oils and inflammable liquids is in an unsatisfactory condition; and I propose to take steps, with a view to legislation on the subject next Session, which will enable the Home Office efficiently to enforce the safe storage of petroleum.

AGRICULTURAL LEASES (SCOTLAND)—A COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Mr. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether Her Majesty's Government will consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission, or otherwise, to inquire into the present condition of tenant farmers and crofters in Scotland, who complain of loss by being bound under nineteen years leases, contracted and entered upon prior to the recent exceptional and apparently permanent fall in the price of agricultural products, with a view to legislation on the subject when Parliament again meets?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.) in reply, said, that as regarded the crofters, their case had already been considered, and the House had resolved not to interfere with their leases. As regarded the farmers, the Government did not, as at present advised, think any public advantage would be gained by an inquiry into the causes which had made, or which might make, contracts freely entered into by private parties onerous to one or other of the contracting parties, nor did they think that such an inquiry, if instituted, could be confined to the case of landlords and tenants; at the same time, for his own part, he was of opinion that landlords would do well to revise the terms of their leases, in order to see how far a modification of the original contracts was desirable under existing circumstances. He believed that this was being done all over Scotland.

Mr. ESSLEMONT asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that certain counties in the Highlands were excluded from the benefits of the Crofters Act; and whether the present Government would remedy this defect in the Act?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, that he was aware that the tenants on small leases were not crofters under the definition adopted in the Crofters Act; but the question whether they should be included in that definition was very fully discussed when the Bill was before the House.

CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1884—EXTENSION OF ACT.

Mr. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether, having regard to the large number of crofters, cottars, and fishermen in the counties of Moray and Nairn, Her Majesty's Government will bring in a Bill to extend the provisions of "The Crofters Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1884," to the crofters, cottars, and fishermen in these counties?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): After the careful consideration given by the House last Session to the question of the area to be dealt with under the Crofters Holdings Act, Her Majesty's Government do not propose to re-open the subject.

VENEZUELA—TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will instruct the Consul General at Caracas to make representations to the Government of Venezuela, with reference to the prohibition at present in force against the importation into the United States of Venezuela of such important articles of commerce as salt, matches, candles, dynamite, tobacco, wearing apparel, and many other articles, as also to obtain, if possible, the withdrawal of the tariff recently imposed on all goods imported, which has paralyzed the West Indian trade with that country?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government are only entitled by Treaty to claim in Venezuela the treatment of the most favoured nation. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that British goods have been less favourably treated than those from other countries, there does not appear to be, in the circumstances stated, any ground for diplomatic representations. With regard to the 30 per cent duty on European goods transhipped at Trinidad to which reference is presumably made in the latter part of the Question, Her Majesty's Government are at present in negotiation with a view to the abolition of this surcharge.

AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES — QUEENSLAND—DIVISION OF THE COLONY.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true that the Colonial Office proposes to introduce a Bill to divide the Colony of Queensland into two portions?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No, Sir; it is not true. There has been a movement in favour of the separation of the Northern part of Queensland, and we are informed that there is a counter movement also. The matter will require the fullest consideration when the whole case has been heard.

ADMIRALTY—MR. W. H. WHITE, NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR AND CONTROLLER.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the First Lord of the

Admiralty, Whether it is true that Mr. W. H. White is holding the appointment of Director of Naval Construction and Assistant Controller of the Navy at the Admiralty, at a salary of £2,000 per annum, while still acting as Consulting Naval Architect to Messieurs Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company (Limited), also at a salary of £2,000; and, whether Mr. W. H. White is under agreement to act as Consulting Naval Architect to Messieurs Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company for a period of ten years?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Mr. White's salary as Director of Naval Construction is correctly stated; but all pecuniary relations between Mr. White and Messrs. Armstrong ceased on his appointment to the Admiralty. Mr. White, when I offered him the post of Director of Naval Construction, was under a legal obligation to remain with Messrs. Armstrong up to the end of March, 1888, as their Naval Constructor. As I explained on the 2nd of April of this year in the House, I succeeded in inducing Messrs. Armstrong to give up their claim upon his services, with the single stipulation that for the remainder of the term he was under contract to serve with them they might occasionally consult him provided that any such consultation should not in any way be inconsistent with or interfere with the discharge of his duties at the Admiralty.

LAW AND JUSTICE—"BRYCE *v.* RUSDEN."

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any statement has yet been received from Sir Arthur Gordon as to the case of "Bryce *v.* Rusden;" and, if so, whether such statement will be published?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Sir Arthur Gordon has not been called upon for any explanations, but did address a despatch to Lord Granville observing upon the remarks made by counsel in the case of "Bryce *v.* Rusden." It was written for the information of the Secretary of State only, and Lord Granville decided that it should not be published. I see no reason for re-opening the matter.

BURMAH—GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT—SEC. 27.

MR. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the special powers under which the Secretary of State for India ordered the annexation of Burmah without consulting his Council were those given by section 26, or those given by section 27, of the Government of India Act; and, if he acted under section 26, whether the reasons which he was bound to record for so doing would be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The powers referred to in the Question are those given by Section 27 of the Government of India Act.

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD—ACCOMMODATION FOR IMBECILE CHILDREN.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is the fact that the accommodation provided for imbecile children by the Metropolitan Asylums Board is insufficient for the needs of the metropolis; and, whether the Board has an unoccupied asylum at Hampstead; and, if so, whether this asylum might not be utilised for the reception of imbecile children?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): It is the fact that the accommodation provided for imbecile children by the Metropolitan Asylums Board is at present insufficient for the needs of the Metropolis. But the Managers are now extending the schools for imbecile children at Darenth. I understand that the buildings will be completed this summer, and it is expected that, when finished, they will afford the accommodation required for children of this class. The Managers have an asylum at Hampstead which is not at this moment occupied; but in the event of any serious increase of fever in the Metropolis it would, no doubt, be necessary to use that asylum for fever patients.

METROPOLITAN POOR AMENDMENT ACT, 1870—RATIONS OF POOR LAW OFFICERS.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local

Government Board, What is the scale fixed by the Board for the cost of the rations of Poor Law officers, chargeable on the Common Poor Fund under the second section of "The Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1870," and what proportion the cost of such rations according to this scale bears to their actual average cost throughout the Metropolis; and, whether he is of opinion that the poorer unions of London receive under this scale the full relief contemplated by the Legislature in passing the Act of 1870?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The scale fixed by the Board for repayment from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund in respect of the rations of officers is—for masters, matrons, medical officers, when resident, schoolmasters, and schoolmistresses, 12*s.* per week each; for other officers, assistants, and servants, 7*s.* per week each. The Poor Law Board, when they fixed this scale in 1870, stated that they were aware that the actual character and cost of the rations allowed differed materially in different workhouses, and they had taken an average sum as fairly approximating the cost. There is no ground for supposing that the cost has increased since that time.

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT) —THE SPECIAL MILITARY OFFICER IN COMMAND.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether any, and, if any, what special instructions have been given to the special Military Officer of high rank appointed to the command of the disturbed districts of Kerry and Clare, with a view to the prevention and detection of crime; whether, if no such special instructions have been given, he will act upon his own discretion, either as to the trial of prisoners, or the calling out of the Military; whether he will be permitted to summon whomsoever he pleases, and privately cross-examine such persons; whether he will have power to try by himself, or order the trial of, such or any other parties, either summarily or by court martial, and to convict them upon such evidence as may have been obtained by private cross-examination; whether he will have power to order the arrest of supposed offenders on suspicion, and without the sworn information of witnesses; whether the trial of persons so arrested will be conducted privately; and, if so, under what branch or rule of the Common or Statute Law; whether the Reports and communications he is to make to the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant will be laid before Parliament; and, what special training he has received in the prevention and detection of crime, or the exercise of the functions of a civil magistrate?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): As this matter concerns the Irish Government, I have been asked by my noble Friend to reply; and I have to say, in answer to the several clauses of this Question, that the Government consider that they have given to the House full and complete information as to the position which will be occupied and the authority which will be exercised by Sir Redvers Buller, and the Government have nothing to add to what has been already stated on these subjects.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman say whether Sir Redvers Buller, as is customary with all magnates sent down to this county, will take up his headquarters at the County Club, Tralee, and take his information from the local landlords?

[No reply.]

MR. CONYBEARE: I should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, whether he would be kind enough to answer the last part of the Question, as it will be in the recollection of the House that it has not any information upon it?

[No reply.]

PAYMENT OF TITHES — LEGISLATION.

MR. H. R. FARQUHARSON (Dorset, W.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Her Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of bringing in a Bill next Session to make the payment of tithes by landlords compulsory?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, that it would be for the Government to consider whether any alteration in the existing law was desirable.

FISHERY COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND) —TRAWLING.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the result of the inquiry into the effects of trawling, which was held by the Fishery Commissioners under the Presidency of Sir Thomas Brady, is yet known; and, if the exemption from trawling now enjoyed by the Firth of Forth will be extended wholly or partially to Galway Bay?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: The Inspectors of Fisheries report that they have not yet arrived at a decision with reference to the trawling at Galway pending the result of inquiries now being held into the subject generally in regard to other parts of Ireland. The Inspectors add, however, that in the course of their inquiry at Galway they received no evidence which would, in their opinion, justify the adoption there of such a bye-law as that which is in force with reference to the Firth of Forth.

BULGARIA—PRINCE ALEXANDER'S RETURN.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West) asked, Whether the Government had any information to communicate to the House with reference to the return of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The last news received by the Secretary of State about the return of Prince Alexander is that he arrived yesterday at Rustchuk, where he was received with great enthusiasm by the population. We do not know the route by which he has since proceeded.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ORDERS—MOTIONS ON PERPETUAL PENSIONS AND INCIDENCE OF THE POOR RATE.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, the Motion for which he had obtained the first place for September 7 being purely a matter of finance, and one which had excited a good deal of interest outside, the Government would permit him to go on with it on that day? In the event of the noble Lord not being in a position to accede to that request, he would venture most earnestly to appeal to him, as the question had not been delayed by any action on his part, as he had pressed it on the attention of the House for some time, and as 30 pensions had been commuted since the matter was first raised, whether the Government would undertake that no further commutation should take place until Parliament had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject?

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said, that he had on the Paper to-morrow a Motion drawing attention to the gross inequality of the existing poor rate; and he wished to know whether the noble Lord proposed that the Government Orders should take precedence of the Notices of Motion to-morrow?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): In reply to the hon. Member who asked the last Question, I should imagine I should be only consulting the general convenience of the House in asking the House to give precedence to Government Orders for to-morrow. I hardly think the hon. Member would himself be of opinion that he could usefully this Session, and at this period of the year, draw attention to the very important subject of which he has given Notice, and therefore it would be my intention to ask the House to agree to the same Resolutions which they adopted last Tuesday. In reply to the hon. Member for Northampton, it would be obvious to him that, even if he brought on his Motion to-morrow and obtained the Committee, that Committee could not possibly proceed to work this Session; and, therefore, the Government would not be inclined to make any exception in the case of the Motion of the hon. Member. But I may add this—that the Government are quite sensible of the importance of the subject with which he has been so long connected, and they are equally sensible of the fact that a great deal of public attention has, by his efforts, been directed to the question of perpetual pensions; and they will be perfectly prepared next Session, if the hon. Member should persevere with this Motion, to grant the Committee for which he asks. I would only say, in view of the statement he made, that a great number of pensions had been commuted since 1881, that I would beg him to bear in mind that neither this Government nor the Conservative Government in Office from June last year to January this year are responsible for the commutation of any one of these pensions. In the meantime, and until the hon. Member brings on his Motion next Session, which I hope he will do early, no further pensions will be commuted.

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked, Whether the Attorney General for Ireland proposed to take the second reading of the Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill to-night? If so, at what hour?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) said, he would proceed with the Bill if it was reached at a reasonable time. Of course, that would depend on the course of the debate.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman be good enough to indicate what he thinks reasonable time?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Member must be aware that there is a Notice of opposition to the Bill; therefore it cannot come on after half-past 12. If, as I hope, the debate on the Address should conclude to-night at a reasonable hour, then my right hon. and learned Friend will proceed with the Bill.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [EIGHTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August].—[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

BURMAH (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—INCIDENCE OF COST.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I rise to move the Amendment to the Address which stands in my name. I must apologize for raising anew a question that was disposed of in the last Parliament; but circumstances have altered considerably since then. The war in Upper Burmah, instead of being a military promenade, costing £300,000, has developed into a national uprising, involving much bloodshed and expenditure. Our forces are to be raised to nearly 30,000 men this coming winter, and no one can tell how long it will take to trample out the resistance of an entire nation. It seems certain that, instead of costing £300,000, it is likely to cost several millions; and I wish this House to consider afresh whether it is fair to throw upon the overburdened Exchequer of India so heavy an additional burden. Then we have further information, since last January, of the increased embarrassment of the finances of India, owing to the heavy fall of silver and exchange; the last Budget presented in June showed a deficit for last year of £2,800,000, and the coming year only showed an equilibrium by taking the exchange at 1*s.* 6*d.*; but exchange has fallen since then to 1*s.* 4¼*d.* at ½*d.*, which will cause a deficit of £1,500,000; and if we add to this probably £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 for the expenses of the war in Burmah, the Indian Exchequer will show the alarming deficit of £4,000,000 next year. These facts were not known, or very imperfectly known, last January or February; and I trust that the new House of Commons will look into these matters fairly and fully, and resolve to relieve India, in whole or in part, of a war which was entered upon contrary to the wishes of her people, and in the supposed interests of England, not of India. My Amendment expresses regret at the continuance and extension of the war; but I might have gone further, and condemned the policy that has led to it. It is true that King Theebaw was a bad Ruler, and that he gave considerable cause of offence to the Government of Lower Burmah, and a plausible excuse might be given for temporary intervention; but I hold that no excuse can be given for annexation. It has violated the deep national convictions of the Burmese, and has led to a war which places us in the most odious light. We have been the cause of the destruction of the capital, Mandalay, and have carried fire and sword all over the country. The prisoners that fall into our hands under the name of dacoits are executed. These men are simply carrying on a guerilla warfare in the manner customary to their country, and we are resorting to measures to crush them that will make us detested by the whole population. We are just doing in Upper Burmah what we condemned the French for doing in Tonquin and Madagascar, and are acting the part of Pharisees when we say we are going there to civilize the people and develop the country. We have caused more misery and loss of life in the last six months than Theebaw did in the six years of his reign, and no end of it can yet be seen. I trust that even yet it is not too late to retire from our false position, just as we have had to do in the Transvaal and Afghanistan. It would be a humiliating thing to do, but better than to lay waste the country with years of internecine warfare. But the main point to which I wish to call the attention of the House is the unfairness of charging the whole cost of the war to India. It was made in defiance of the unanimous Native opinion of India. I can testify, from my observations made when travelling through the country soon after the annexation was proclaimed, that not a Native voice was raised in favour of it; it was universally regarded as purely a British affair, in which India had no interest; the Indian people believed it was made in the interests of British trade, and I think they were not far wrong. Those addresses from the Chambers of Commerce reveal the cloven foot pretty clearly. Let me read to the House the Resolution passed at the National Indian Congress held last year—

> "That this Congress deprecates the annexation of Upper Burmah, and considers that if the Government unfortunately decide on annexation, the entire country of Burmah should be separated from the Indian Viceroyalty, and constituted a Crown Colony, as distinct in all matters from the Government of this country as is Ceylon."

This Congress was truly representative of the best Native opinion in India; it consisted of the ablest Natives from all parts of India; many of the number were highly cultivated gentlemen, and its opinion ought to have weight with the Government of this country. The Burmese are, in all respects, distinct from the people of India; ethnologically, they are a different race; they are of a different religion, being Buddhists, and have far more affinity with the Chinese than with the Hindoos. It seems to me a mere pretext to say that such a war was necessary for the safety of India; but it may be said that India derives a large surplus revenue from Lower Burmah. I suppose it remits a sum of somewhere between £500,000 and £1,000,000 to the Indian Treasury; but the war by which we acquired Lower Burmah cost, I understand, £15,000,000 sterling, so that this so-called surplus revenue only defrays the charge of the Debt it imposed on India. I would be fairly satisfied, however, if the House decided to limit the charge on India to the surplus revenue from Lower Burmah, and place the remainder on England. I have dealt so far mainly with the question of justice; but I wish also to appeal to the sentiment of mercy. India is a desperately poor country; it is far below the poverty of any country that we hear of in Europe. I must say to the House that I was startled at the results of my inquiries as to the social condition of the people. I am sure, if the House and the people of this country realized the condition of the masses of the Indian people, they would not permit heavy burdens to be thrown upon them with the haste which is too often done. I hope the House will allow me to read a short extract from the Budget speech of Sir Evelyn Baring, when Finance Minister of India, 18th March, 1882—

> "It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than 27 rupees a-year; and, though I am not prepared to pledge myself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the taxpaying community is exceedingly poor. To derive any very large increase of revenue from so poor a population as this is obviously impossible, and, if it were possible, would be unjustifiable."

Again, in the discussion on the same Budget, he said, after repeating the above statement of 27 rupees per head per annum—

> ". . . . But he thought it was quite sufficient to show the extreme poverty of the mass of the people. In England the average income per head of population was £33 per head; in France it was £23; in Turkey, which was the poorest country in Europe, it was £4 per head. He would ask hon. Members to think what 21 rupees per annum was to support a person, and then he would ask whether a few annas was nothing to such a poor people?"

I am bound to say that most of the good authorities I met with in India considered Sir Evelyn Baring's estimate as too high; and, certainly, I should not put the average income at over £2 per head, which would give £400,000,000 for British India; whereas the best statists put the aggregate income of the United Kingdom at £1,250,000,000 reckoned in the same manner. But let us take another test—the income tax. It is levied on all incomes of £50 per annum and above; whereas, in England, it begins at £150; but there are some large classes of exemptions in India, so that, on the whole, a fair comparison can be made as to taxpaying power. Now, 1*d.* in the income tax here realizes about £2,000,000—in India, a little over £200,000; so that, speaking roughly, the ability of India to pay income tax is only 1-10th what it is in this country, though the population is six times as large. That is, on a given area of population in India there is only 1-60th part of the taxable wealth there is in this country. I may add that only one person in 700 is liable to income tax—that is, has an income of £50 per annum—allowing for the limited class of exemptions already referred to. As another proof of the poverty of India, I may add that the best authorities have calculated that 50,000,000 of the population only eat one meal a day, and that of the coarsest food. In years of scarcity vast masses of the population are on the verge of famine, and would die of starvation unless fed by the Government; and, in spite of a very large expenditure on relief works, it is computed that 10,000,000 of people died of famine in the decade ending 1880. India is a country almost entirely of poor peasantry, the bulk of whom are hopelessly in debt to the money-lenders. I was assured that as many as 9-10ths of the ryots were in debt; but authorities like Sir James Caird put the number at 3-4ths; and so small are their holdings that in Bengal, out of 10,000,000 of holdings, it is computed that 6,000,000 do not pay a rent of more than 5 rupees each. Compare that with Ireland, where it is considered a proof of extreme poverty that 100,000 or 150,000 holdings are under £5 each. The fact is, the mass of the Indian peasantry are below the level of the peasantry of Connaught. It is impossible to screw more taxes out of the people without oppressing or demoralizing them. You cannot add to the income tax, which is hated in India on account of its inquisitorial character, and the great amount of black-mail which it leads to among the subordinate officials. It would be cruel to add to the salt tax, which is enormously high already, and is a first necessity of life in India. The Government is already demoralizing the people, by forcing on them liquor shops for the sake of revenue; are they to be forced still further in this direction? You cannot screw more revenue out of India, unless you re-impose Customs duties—the only tax which India would willingly pay, but which British selfishness forbids. I protest against any further burdens being placed on the poor, afflicted people of India. I do not believe that the British democracy would willingly be a party to such cruelty. If you relieve India of the cost of the Burmese War, she will still have a deficit in the coming year of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000, owing to the further fall of silver and exchange. Her financiers are at their wits' end with this tremendous difficulty; they are appealing to the Home Government to help them in their difficulties, and, so far, they have appealed in vain; but I am glad to think that the present Administration is prepared to help them so far as to grant a Royal Commission of Inquiry on the subject. I will not enlarge on this, as it would take me outside the limits of my Amendment; but before sitting down I would call the attention of the House to the rapid growth of an educated Native opinion in India, which judges us by the same political standards we ourselves apply. Nothing struck me more in India, than the rapid growth of political intelligence. We cannot afford to treat India any longer as a nation of children. The debates in this House are carefully perused by thousands of the Natives; the principles of the "Mid Lothian speeches" are applied to themselves; and I am sorry to have to say that the general judgment of India is that we do not hold the scales fairly. They resent the charge to India of any of the cost of the wars in Egypt or Abyssinia. They were indignant at the waste of their resources in Afghanistan; and if several millions are added to their Debt on account of Upper Burmah, their loyalty to this country will be severely strained. The universal complaint in India is the excessive costliness of our Government. The expenditure has grown enormously of late years; it is entirely outstepping the resources of the country. The Budget of £75,000,000 last year would have made old Indian Administrators, like Lord Lawrence, stand aghast; but next year it will be nearly £80,000,000 if the cost of this unjust Burmese War be thrown upon India. I ask you to agree to this Amendment on the broad ground of justice, because this is rather a British than an Indian war. I ask you to do so on the ground of mercy, because India is a very poor and heavily-taxed country; and, lastly, on the ground of policy, because it will strengthen loyalty among our Indian subjects, and show them that, though not represented here, the British Parliament will not spurn their mute appeal.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.), in rising to second the Motion, said, he thought it could be justified on Constitutional grounds. Since the discussion on this subject in February last the war in Burmah had developed to a degree which was not anticipated then; and results had arisen, which were not foreseen at the time, which must be very long continued in their action. They were justified, he thought, on the ground of Parliamentary precedent, in bringing forward this Motion, and getting a final decision as to who should pay the expenses of the war. Resolutions similar to that passed in February had been passed without prejudice in relation to the Egyptian and Afghan Wars, in respect of which contributions were afterwards made by England to the Indian Exchequer. The Motion was justified on another ground—that the House had not yet been put in possession of Lord Dufferin's views as to what he considered the best treatment of the Burmese Question. So far as he was aware, they had no justification from those in responsible positions in India for the annexation of Upper Burmah. Nay, further, it was clear that the annexation was carried out by the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) without consulting the Indian Council. That was only made known to the House on February 25 last, and confirmed by the Under Secretary to-night. He did not say the noble Lord, in so acting, was doing an unconstitutional thing; but that fact was not in possession of the House during the discussion in January or February last. He hoped the House would consider the information which it had on this subject. In February last they had very little information, and now they had little more. Beyond the despatch of December 31, with which the Blue Book concluded, very little further information had been vouchsafed to the House; and the final and definite proposals which were then promised, and on which the policy of annexation was based—a policy which the Liberal Government accepted—had not yet been laid upon the Table of the House. They had not only no information in regard to the conduct of affairs in Burmah; they had no justification of those responsible in India for the annexation and the great development which had taken place in the war. There was a great deal more information one would like to hear in connection with the conduct of the war, and the administration of the country since last February; for it was impossible—although one did not like to impute blame in the absence of information—to come to any other conclusion than that there had been in some quarters very grave miscarriage and bungling to bring about the existing state of affairs in that country. The decision which the House came to in February last with reference to the expenses of the Expedition should not bind it irrevocably under the altered circumstances of the case. In February it was thought the annexation of Burmah would be little more than a great triumphal march; but all that had been changed, and they were in November next to have over 30,000 troops in Burmah. There had been no fresh or definite information supplied to the House on the question of the expenses of the annexation. The future expenditure was put down in March in Sir Auckland Colvin's Financial Statement at 30 lacs of rupees, and the Under Secretary a few nights ago gave them no further information; but, seeing that the warlike forces in Burmah had increased fivefold since then, the estimate was absolutely valueless, and the figures given could not be accepted as giving a full and complete account of what the expenditure might be. He did not like to prophesy what the expense would be; but it would be very heavy. He was afraid the House and the country must now abandon all those rose-coloured pictures about the people of Upper Burmah desiring the establishment of British rule in that country. We might call the opposition that of dacoits and robbers; but we were really face to face with a national resistance of the population of Upper Burmah. That general resistance did not take place till the annexation was finally decided upon. The people were quite ready to get rid of Theebaw; but they wanted to see established some kind of Native Government, perhaps under British control. Another important point was our relations with China in consequence of the annexation, on which the House ought to have more information. A great point had been made in connection with the annexation as to the extension of British trade that would result, especially with China. So far as he could make out, the terms of the Treaty, announced by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs the other night, practically gave China everything she wanted, and the prospect of opening up a profitable trade between India and China *viâ* Burmah was not very greatly facilitated by the course that had been taken. There was to be a Boundary Commission and a Frontier Trade Commission, and anything or everything might be ceded under either Commission. If they were going to throw all the expense of these operations on the Indian Exchequer they ought to be able to show a stronger case as to this being an exclusively Indian war. The closest precedents were the Persian War of 1856 and the Afghan War. The Afghan War, for example, was undertaken to remedy what was believed to be a state of insecurity on the frontier, and it was originally proposed and resolved to throw the whole expense of the Expedition on the Indian Exchequer. The question was subsequently reconsidered, and the ultimate conclusion arrived at was that the Home Government agreed to pay £5,000,000, or about one-fourth out of £20,000,000, which was the cost of the war. It was contended in favour of that course that unless the war could be shown to be an exclusively Indian war the expense ought not to be put exclusively on the Indian Exchequer. In this case he did not think that the House was prepared to admit that the Burmese War was in any sense exclusively an Indian war, and one in which Imperial interests had no part. The hon. Gentleman concluded by seconding the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words,—"And this House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston), in rising to move, as an Amendment to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. Samuel Smith) to the Address, to leave out all the words after "Burmah, and" to the end of the proposed Amendment, in order to add the words—

"At learning that the Government have resolved to persevere in their policy of annexation, especially as the Native population have, by their active hostility and armed resistance to the invading forces, shown that they have no desire to live under British rule,"

said, he desired to refer at the outset to the attempts which had been made on his own side of the House to frame an Amendment to the Address regarding this question which should clearly embody their opinions, and which should prevent complications arising when the division was announced. These attempts had not been successful; and it was because the Amendment of the hon. Member (Mr. Samuel Smith) did not raise the question into the higher regions to which he thought it ought to be raised, and did not condemn the character of the war, nor express an opinion as to whether it was righteous or not in its commencement and in its continuance, that he felt compelled to bring forward his Amendment. He regretted that it had been said in a Liberal organ that whether the war was just or unjust, now we were in for it we must, for the honour of the country, fight it out. In the last Parliament he listened attentively to the debates dealing with the question of Burmah in the hope that he would learn the real reasons for the war, but in vain. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the

Exchequer approached the consideration of the question on that occasion with a light heart, and openly exulted in the part that he had played in connection with promoting that war. He said that he was proud in belonging to a Government that had added to the Dominions of the Crown and the enterprise of British commerce, and to civilization and progress, so vast and valuable a possession. It seemed to him (Mr. Cremer), however, that the noble Lord on that occasion was premature in announcing that Upper Burmah as a valuable possession had been added to the Dominions of the Crown. He (Mr. Cremer) contended that no valid reason was given at the time for the war in Burmah. The real cause of the war was given by the then Secretary of State for India, who said that the Viceroy thought that the war must be undertaken for the safety and protection of British Burmah and of Her Majesty's Dominions in other parts of the world; and he estimated that the cost of the Expedition would probably not exceed £300,000. It was also alleged that it was necessary, for the protection and safety of British Burmah, to depose King Theebaw; but the feeble resistance of Theebaw proved that the fears entertained by the Government as to the dangers to be apprehended from that Monarch were absolutely groundless. If the real object of the war had been to depose this wicked Monarch, King Theebaw, as they had been told, why should they not have set up another in his place? Lord Harris said that there were no less than 70 surviving Members of the Royal Family to choose from, and surely some one of the number might have been found to occupy the Throne of King Theebaw. It was quite clear such was not the intention of the Government neither in the first nor in the last instance, and that they had other objects in view. He had often observed that for months before a warlike expedition was set on foot the Press were very busy circulating reports with regard to the mischief going on from the action of somebody somewhere, and so paving the way for an Ultimatum or Expedition. In the same way, for several months before action was taken by the Government, the Press of this country were continually telling the world that King Theebaw was a wicked Monarch, and constantly breaking his word. Why, they had Monarchs nearer home who had been guilty of offences of that kind. Recently there was a question of the violation by a Monarch of a Treaty or obligation which he was said to have come under with this and other countries; but there had been no words about an Ultimatum or Expedition to chastise the Ruler in question or depose him from his Throne. We reserved our wrath, indignation, and chastisement for weak rather than strong Monarchs. Then it was said that King Theebaw had been very cruel to his subjects. Some could recollect the horrors perpetrated by Napoleon III. on December 2 upon his subjects; but we caressed him as our good and faithful ally. As in the case of Egypt, so with regard to Burmah, one of the reasons given out for the Expedition was that the French would have gone there if we had not. All he (Mr. Cremer) could say was that if we made the same muddle and created the same disturbances in Burmah as the result of our interference as we had effected in Egypt, it would have been much better that we should have left King Theebaw and his subjects to settle their relations and differences by themselves, and without our interference; and it was an unfortunate thing, both for Burmah and for the British people, that we had gone there. We had now 30,000 soldiers and police in Upper Burmah, and reinforcements were on their way; and yet it was said that our hold upon that country was not increasing; but anarchy and confusion were increasing in British Burmah; and we held our position in Mandalay with difficulty. Unhappily, the remarkable letters of the Rangoon Correspondent of *The Times* showed that we were in a fair way of already producing similar disastrous results. He wanted to know who were the wire-pullers who brought about all these little wars? He entirely repudiated the doctrine that this country was justified in invading and annexing other countries for the sake of extending British commerce or extending the Dominions of the Crown. He believed that the Government, Parliament, and the nation had been deceived by the Indian officials with reference to the real condition of affairs in Upper Burmah, and that the people of that country had shown by their protracted resistance that they had no desire for British rule. He had brought forward his Amendment because he believed that by our conduct there we had violated the Proclamation in which was solemnly stated that Her Majesty's Government did not desire any further extension of Her Majesty's Dominions in India. The people of Upper Burmah were now only doing that which we had been taught was the sacred duty of all good citizens—namely, to repel by every means in their power the invaders of their country. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

To leave out all the words after the words "Burmah, and" to the end of the proposed Amendment, in order to add the words "at learning that the Government have resolved to persevere in their policy of annexation, especially as the Native population have, by their active hostility and armed resistance to the invading forces, shown that they have no desire to live under British rule,"—(*Mr. Cremer,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham) said, he understood the hon. Member for West Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) to complain that the House was obliged to discuss this difficult question without the Papers being before it. His noble Friend the Secretary of State for India (Viscount Cross), the moment he took Office, did his utmost to provide the House with adequate information on the subject. He (Sir John Gorst) desired to express his regret that the Blue Book, containing all information with regard to Burmah—and which had been promised by the noble Viscount—was not yet in the hands of hon. Members. It was prepared, and was now in the hands of the printer, and he expected every day it would be distributed to hon. Members. It appeared to him that the Amendments which had been moved raised considerations for the House of Commons upon three points—First, whether the Government was to blame for the prolongation of the war in Upper Burmah, for, of course, every hon. Member in that House must feel regret for that prolongation; secondly, whether the expenses of that war should be borne exclusively by the Revenues of India; and, thirdly, whether Her Majesty's Government should persevere in the attempt to make Upper Burmah a part of the British Dominions, or whether they ought to hand back the country to some Native Potentate under some conditions not specified in the Amendment which had just been moved? Upon these three points he would endeavour to give the House the most frank and ample information. In the course of the speeches which had been delivered that evening reference had been made to one point which was quite outside the scope of the Amendments, and that was with reference to the negotiations that had recently taken place with regard to Upper Burmah between the Government of India and that of the Empire of China. On this point it would be sufficient for him to repeat the language of his right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson), to the effect that a Convention satisfactory to all parties had been arrived at between the two Governments, and which gave great advantages to this country. He might further say upon this point that the action of the Chinese Government throughout the negotiations which had resulted in this Convention being agreed upon had been of the most friendly character. If hon. Members were dissatisfied with the course which had been pursued in this matter they ought to have brought it before the House in the shape of a definite Motion, and not in the form of an Amendment to the Address. He did not think that by either of the Amendments which had been moved the question of the justice of the original invasion of Upper Burmah had been distinctly raised, although undoubtedly the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) had in the course of his speech asserted that that war was unnecessary and unrighteous in its inception. If hon. Members held such an opinion it was their duty to have challenged the policy and the justice of the war by some direct Motion; and if they declined to take that course they ought to refrain from making statements which were derogatory to the honour and the humanity of this country. The question of the justice and necessity of the original war in Upper Burmah was not in any sense a Party one. The initiative in the matter was due to Lord Dufferin as Governor General of India, and the proposal for the invasion of Upper Burmah was only made after long years of resistance of the idea on the part of the Indian Government. The opinion of Lord Dufferin having been communicated to the noble Lord the present Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), when Secretary of State for India, he and his Colleagues gave the policy proposed by Lord Dufferin their full sanction. Subsequently it became the duty of the late Government to review the action of Lord Dufferin and of their Predecessors in making this war, and they came to the conclusion that the war was not a trade war in any sense, but had been undertaken for the protection and safety of British Burmah and of our Indian Dominions in general. In the debate on the 22nd February the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said—

> "The Mover of the Amendment says that Indian funds should be expended in Indian interests. Most certainly; and it is upon the grounds of Indian interests, if at all, that this war and this annexation are to be justified."

In a later portion of his speech the right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "It was not to extend trade, to gratify passion or ambition, but because a door was threatened to be opened through which would have been brought into India danger, insecurity, loss of happiness, and prosperity. The mass of people depend entirely on our sovereign rule in that country; and it was to defend them, and not for the purpose of giving effect to any idle dreams, that this war was believed to be necessary. . . . . I do believe that it has been in reality, and certainly in intention, a defensive war. I do not believe, for a moment, that the late Government would have taken up this question in a spirit of aggression."—(3 *Hansard*, [302] 967-8-9.)

After that admission on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as to the policy of the Burmese War, he was justified in asking hon. Members who had insinuated that the war was unjust to take the proper Constitutional course of inviting the opinion of the House of Commons upon it. The extract he had quoted seemed to him to dispose of the question whether the expenses of the war should be thrown upon the Revenues of India. No reason whatever had been adduced why, if this were defensible in Indian interests, the ordinary rule as to placing such a charge upon the Revenues of India should not prevail. The precedent quoted did not apply in the present case. The Persian War was made upon a Power entirely external to India. The Egyptian War was still more remote, and entirely different in character from the Burmese War. He (Sir John Gorst) would say, without fear of contradiction, that no precedent could be produced, and no reason given, why the ordinary rule as to India paying the cost of this Expedition should not apply. A great part of the speech of the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. Samuel Smith) was taken up by an appeal to the House on the ground of the extreme poverty of the Natives of India. No doubt the possibility of increased taxation in India was a very serious question to contemplate; but although the poverty of the Natives of India might be a strong ground for retrenchment in the general expenditure of India, it was not a ground for placing upon the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, who after all were, the majority of them, not very rich people, an expenditure which did not properly belong to them. To go to the original Burmese War, some critics had alleged that if it had been prosecuted with more vigour, and more violent measures at first, possibly resistance to our arms might never have made its appearance. The instructions given to Sir Harry Prendergast were that, as the people with whom he was to fight were not hostile, but were a nation identical in race, religion, and interests with our own people in British Burmah, they were not to be treated as a hostile people. The invasion was carried out in accordance with these instructions, little loss of life occurred, and very trifling conflict took place. Hon. Members ought to rejoice that an Expedition of this magnitude was carried out with so very trifling a loss of life as the Burmese Expedition was. What had been the effect of the principle kept in view in invading Burmah? The result had been that the village population was almost entirely friendly to us. Although our troops had been quartered in Mandalay and other towns, and had mixed freely with the people, there had been no murders, and no crimes of violence. That did not look as if the people of Burmah were so rancorously hostile to us as the hon. Member for Shoreditch supposed. It was also the fact that, when parties of our troops went into the country villages, the villagers always spontaneously supplied them with water and other necessaries. Then they were told that the country was overrun by bands of dacoits, and by insurgent Princes. Newspaper correspondents wrote very graphically for the amusement of their readers, and, no doubt, made the country they described appear somewhat worse than it was. But, however bad Burmah might be at the present time, and assuming all that the Rangoon Correspondent of *The Times* said to be correct, yet it was no worse than before our invasion of the country. People spoke as if we had overturned some quiet and settled Government in Burmah, and had produced anarchy. What we had really done was, to step into the shoes of the old Government, and, having done so, we found how much there was to be done before the country could be brought to that satisfactory state in which a country under the protection of our rule ought to be. If the House would permit him, he would read an extract from a Report made by the Viceroy (Lord Dufferin) which induced the late Government to approve the policy of annexing Burmah. The Report was made on the 17th of February of the present year, when the Viceroy was at Mandalay. He said—

> "It is only by annexation, and the establishment of British administration, that we can hope to rescue Upper Burmah from the state of lawlessness and anarchy in which so many parts are plunged."

He might state that the extract he was reading would appear in Papers to be presented to the House. Lord Dufferin proceeded—

> "The country has at all times, and even under its best Princes, suffered from the depredations of gang robbers or dacoits, recruited not only from among the bad characters of the towns and villages of Burmah proper, but from the Shans and other hill tribes of the surrounding mountain tracts. Under Theebaw's maladministration, these chronic outbreaks were greatly intensified and extended, and the ill-directed efforts of his Ministers have failed to suppress them, even in the neighbourhood of the capital. Indeed, it is universally believed that the relations of more than one of the Hloot-daw with dacoits were friendly and mutually profitable. Nor can it be denied that recent events, the disbandment of the late King's troops, and the confusion and uncertainty which the overthrow of the Native Government must for the time engender, have supplied them with additional recruits and a fresh stimulus. There is, indeed, a curious element of restlessness in the Burmese character which gives a great deal of trouble in Lower Burmah, and invariably develops into crime under the influence of popular excitement or of any inviting opportunity. Nothing is more common than for a young man who was yesterday tilling his fields, to all appearance a respectable and well-disposed cultivator, suddenly to disappear from his home and attach himself for a time to a gang of professional dacoits in order to taste the novelty and delight of an adventurous onslaught upon villages in another neighbourhood. When men of settled occupation can thus behave, it is, of course, quite natural that the unemployed or idle members of the community—and in Burmah the industry of the women supports a large idle class—should join such gangs where dacoity is rife. The people generally, while light-hearted and engaging in many ways, have a strain of savagery and cruelty in their disposition which breaks out at times into wanton exercise, and can only be suppressed by firm and even severe handling. It is a mistake to suppose that the dacoits, who are now disturbing the peace of many districts in Upper Burmah, and whose incursions into Lower Burmah caused for a time so much anxiety to the local officers, are chiefly bands of patriots or partizan warriors, opposing the invasion of their country by a Foreign Power. Their object, for the most part, is plunder, and their attacks are principally directed, not against our parties or posts, as the fact of only seven British rank and file having fallen during the whole campaign sufficiently proves, but against the defenceless villages of their own countrymen, who apply for and welcome our patrols and columns as their only defence against their inroads. It is true that larger bodies, recruited from the disbanded soldiery and the more necessitous and adventurous portion of the population, may occasionally gather to a head under the standard of some Prince, and in right of their numbers be entitled to claim a more honourable designation than the bands of pillagers technically known as 'dacoits;' but it must be remembered that even these Princes are fighting each for his own hand and his own personal ascendancy, and are not banded in a common cause against us. Whether, however, we call them dacoits, robbers, partizans, insurgents, rebels, or patriots, it is equally certain that in the interests of the community at large they must be summarily put down, though the execution of this task should be conducted in as humane, forbearing, and considerate a manner as possible."

What has since happened was contemplated by Lord Dufferin. Writing on the 17th of February last his Lordship said—

> "It would be a work consequently of time, as we know from experience in Lower Burmah, to convince the disorderly and ill-disposed that we intend them to receive us as their rulers, and to respect our standard of civic discipline and political morality. The situation, moreover, is undoubtedly complicated by the fact of any Alompra Prince, under the Native Government, having been always able to obtain some sort of following whenever he attempted to raise his flag and strike a blow for the Throne. Hence the jealousy with which the reigning Monarch kept his near relatives shut up within the

> Palace, and hence the terrible massacres of the Royal kind which from time to time took place in Mandalay. Hence, also, the close seclusion of the King himself within his Palace, as any excursion outside exposed him to the risk of attack from some one or other of his relatives who might have gathered round him a band of followers. On one of the rare occasions when Theebaw's father, who was undoubtedly a respectable Ruler, had proceeded to a summer-house at no great distance from the city, he was attacked by his own son, the Myngoon Prince, to whom I have already referred. The Heir Apparent was killed, and the King barely escaped with his life by the back door of the summer-house in which he was sleeping. The Monarchy not being strictly hereditary, every Prince was a possible King, and never abandoned the hope of being able some day to secure the Throne. There are now wandering about the jungle not less than five of these Princes, to say nothing of pretenders, each with his small party of followers. But the objects and procedure of these bands differ little from those of ordinary dacoits. The Princes themselves are men of no importance or influence apart from the accident of their birth, and when the ammunition of their followers fails, their adherents will probably disperse of their own accord, if they are not sooner broken up by our troops. In a year or two, however, we ought to have the whole country reasonably quiet. When we remember how long dacoity lasted after our occupation of Bengal; that 30 years ago the neighbourhood of Calcutta was rendered unsafe by gangs of dacoits; that within a still more recent period it was impossible to wander three or four miles out of Poonah without a guard, and that there is at the present moment a dacoit leader at large in the Central Provinces who has for years defied all the efforts to capture him put forth by our own police and by those of several Native States, there is no reason to be dissatisfied with the prospect before us or impatient at the progress already made."

Assuming that the worst accounts were accurate, the despatches in the Blue Book conclusively showed that the state of the country was no worse than it was in the time of King Theebaw. In fact, at that time the country was infested by bands of dacoits, who roamed about without check, creating disturbances. The great town of Bhamo about two years ago was seized by a band of filibusters, who could not be displaced by the Mandalay Government. So far from a dislike of British rule being the cause of Princes and pretenders roaming about the country, that had been the chronic state of Burmah for many years past. As he had given the opinion and statement of the Viceroy, he did not think he should be justified in asking the House to listen to a number of extracts from the Blue Books. What he had said disposed, he thought, of any blame which some hon. Members might feel inclined to cast upon the Executive Government for the prolongation, as they called it, of the Burmese War. But the hon. Member for Shoreditch said—"Oh, but you ought not to have annexed Burmah. You ought to have turned it into a protected State. You ought to have placed a Burmese Prince on the Throne, and in that way you would have avoided all this national resistance." In answer to that he could say that undoubtedly the question was one of difficulty; that it was carefully considered by the late Government and the Government which preceded it; and that the two Governments in India and the two Governments in the United Kingdom came to the conclusion that the safest course, after all, was to annex Burmah to the British Dominions. The final decision was arrived at on the 16th of February by the late Government upon receipt of a telegram of the 13th of February from the Viceroy, which summarized the Memorandum to which he (Sir John Gorst) had already called the attention of the House. If hon. Members would study the Memorandum and the views of the Viceroy, which were adopted by both Governments, they would find that there were serious objections to the plan, which looked *primâ facie* a very plausible one, of turning Burmah into a protected State. The hon. Member's idea was originally the idea of Lord Dufferin. All his Lordship's prejudices were in favour of turning Burmah into a protected State, and it was the force of logic and the irresistible facts brought to bear at Mandalay that induced him to change his mind and come to the conclusion that annexation was the best and the safest course. There is a great deal of difference between the Princes of a country like Burmah and the Native Sovereigns of India. The Indian Princes were more civilized; they were all of them friendly to us, and most of them desired to assimilate the administration of their government to the administration of the Provinces of British India, by which they were surrounded. But the Burmese Princes belonged to a wholly different order. They had ideas on the subject of government which were wholly incomprehensible to us, and no doubt some of our ideas on the subject were wholly incomprehensible to them. They had an idea that they were superior to all other created beings. Then it must be remembered that the Burmese dignitaries who surrounded the Throne, and who exercised a very large share of power, did not want to have any real Sovereign. They wanted to have a puppet Sovereign who would act according to their wishes. These persons were implicated in the massacres which had occurred at various periods of King Theebaw's reign. The hon. Member for Shoreditch said—"Surely among 70 you could find one Prince who was suitable." But there was not one who could reasonably and with any prospect of ultimate advantage be placed upon the Throne; and, therefore, the Viceroy and the late Government and the former Government were driven to the conclusion at which they arrived, much as they disliked any extension of the British Dominions. When hon. Members should have seen the Papers which were to be presented to Parliament they would, he felt sure, ascribe none but the most patriotic motives to the present Government and their Predecessors. He would now tell the House what was the military position. There were not 30,000 troops in Upper Burmah, as some hon. Members stated, but between 15,000 and 16,000, posted at Mandalay, Bhamo, and in some 30 or 40 places stationed along the banks in the valleys of the two chief rivers of the country—the Irrawaddy and the Kyenduenrhe Rivers. The troops would make no general movement at present against the insurgent Princes or large bands of dacoits, because the season of the year was not favourable to operations of that kind. They were, for the most part, confining themselves to giving protection to the villagers against the dacoits, who did not attack our position, but did attack their own countrymen. As soon as the cold season should begin it was the intention of the Government to amass in Upper Burmah such a force as would put down all armed resistance to our rule. Nobody could regret more than he did any necessity for an increase of the military expenditure in Burmah; but it was better and more economical to send such a number of troops to that country as would put down all armed resistance once for all than to keep sending insufficient forces, the effect of which must be to prolong operations for an indefinite period. The Government had thereupon determined to increase the Forces now in Burmah in the cold season, when they would number 30,000 men of all arms, under the command of General Sir Herbert Macpherson, Commander-in-Chief in Madras. In addition on the rivers there would be an armed flotilla consisting of three armed war steamers, three armed tenders, and two armed launches, all having 12-pounders and machine-guns on board. These, it was hoped, would render the river communication perfectly secure, and would assist the troops in subduing and clearing the country. If time permitted, other steamers of light draught, &c. would also be despatched. With regard to civil government, it was a great mistake to suppose that Upper Burmah was now under Military Law; the whole of the country was under civil authority. It had been divided into 20 districts, over each of which an efficient European officer had been placed. These gentlemen had been chiefly drawn from the officials of Lower Burmah, and, to some extent, from civilians in that country who were able to speak Burmese, for it was absolutely necessary that every man appointed to this delicate and difficult position should be a master of the Native language. The country had been provided with a suitable code of law, enacted partly by an Indian Statute Law and partly by Proclamation under English law, with such amendments as were suitable to the unsettled condition of the country. There were no such things as military executions now going on there, and while the administration of the law would be firm and resolute, the Viceroy had every intention to make it as humane and merciful as possible. And now as to finance. Though the question of finance was, he was bound to say, unsatisfactory, it was really not so bad as the hon. Member for Flintshire seemed to suppose. There was spent on the war in the past quarter a sum of 30 lacs of rupees. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) asked for the actual figure of the Revised Estimate; but that had not yet been received in this country. What was called the Revised Estimate consisted of the actual expenditure for nine months up to the end of last year, and an estimated expenditure for the remaining three months up to the 31st March last, and it was accurate to within a very small amount; but the Budget

Estimate for the present year, which was only 30 lacs of rupees, was certainly very largely exceeded. He was not able to state the exact figure by which it was exceeded; but no doubt it would be very much more than 30 lacs. He thought, however, he might almost promise that what the hon. Member for Flintshire said he would be contented with would be carried out in the present year—namely, that the extra expenditure beyond the revenue from Upper Burmah would not exceed the surplus which was paid into the Indian Revenue from Lower Burmah. Last year there was paid into the Indian Exchequer from Lower Burmah a surplus of 100 lacs of rupees; and he thought he might almost promise, unless something very unforeseen took place, that the expenditure on Upper Burmah would, at all events, not be so great as to swallow up this surplus from Lower Burmah. There was also every reason to hope, when the country was settled and the Government established in the way in which he believed it would be established, that very soon the Revenues of Upper Burmah would be sufficient to meet the expenses of its administration. He did not know that a very large surplus could be expected or ought to be drawn from a country like Burmah and paid into the Exchequer of another country; but he believed there was no reason to suppose that Upper Burmah would be any permanent burden on the Revenues of India, or that the state of things in the former country would aggravate that expenditure which the hon. Member for Flintshire so much regretted. In conclusion, he assured the House that the Government would be the last to complain of hon. Members who asked for information upon a subject of such importance as that now under discussion. He hoped the explanation he had given would to some extent re-assure and satisfy hon. Members; and that they would believe Her Majesty's Government was fully alive to the difficulties of the situation and the responsibilities they had incurred, and were animated by a sincere desire to do that which was for the real welfare of the people of Upper Burmah, and likely to insure the safety, security, and tranquillity of those enormous populations in India for which we had made ourselves responsible.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) admitted that there was a great deal of truth in the contention of the hon. Member for Flintshire that the people of India had but little interest in the war in Burmah. At the same time it would, in his opinion, be very hard upon the British taxpayer if he were compelled to pay for all the mistakes that might be committed by the numberless Governors and Administrators of our vast Empire. The annexation of Burmah, he feared, might prove to have been a mistake, and he confessed he was not at all re-assured by the *couleur de rose* statement of the Under Secretary of State for India. He was afraid that the dacoity now prevailing was really very much in the nature of a popular resistance to our rule. What alarmed him was that the disturbances were not confined to Upper Burmah, but existed also in Lower Burmah; and if that were so in a country which we had possessed for so many years, it augured ill for an early settlement of our troubles and difficulties in our new acquisition. The dacoity of which Calcutta was formerly the scene was not analogous, as Lord Dufferin maintained in his Report. As to the Revenue of Lower Burmah, he denied that there was a surplus of £1,000,000. That could not be so if the share which it had to contribute towards the expenses of the general government of India were reckoned. He admitted that when the war broke out, not knowing much of the country, he refrained from committing himself to any opinion against it; but he now saw very good reason to doubt whether the annexation would turn out a good one, and he was not now convinced by what had been said by the Under Secretary. It seemed to him that Her Majesty's Government had taken a great responsibility upon themselves in this annexation, apart from any action of the late Administration, and if it turned out well they would be entitled to be acquitted of blame, but if it turned out ill the blame would rest upon them. As to the conduct of the campaign, he hoped that it would be found that the Madras Army had been able to do good service in Burmah; but he was not satisfied that the military affairs in Burmah had been conducted with that care, judiciousness, and mercy which ought to have characterized them.

An officer, who had lately returned from Burmah, had told him things about the action of the military which had made his hair stand on end. It seemed to him that the moral of the whole of this Burmese War was to avoid French scares; that in that respect he thought we should look to the beam in our own eye before we sought to take the mote out of our neighbour's eye. We stole sheep all over the world, but went into transports of pious horror whenever the French stole a lamb. He believed the French people were, in the main, opposed to foreign annexation, aggression, and war. He thought that this country ought not to be led into aggression of this sort in order, as he had said, to meet French scares. It was true that the late Government had also been guilty of wars of a similar kind. He would ask Her Majesty's Ministers to take warning by the fate of the late Prime Minister, who sacrificed his policy, his Government, and the respect of Parliament, because he was led into wars of annexation.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said, he rose only to refer to a point which he thought had been somewhat irregularly raised by the hon. Member for West Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan). That hon. Member alluded to the recently concluded Convention between this country and the Government of China, and made some remarks upon it which he should be sorry to allow to pass without notice; because in that case the House might suppose that the late Government, in whose time the Convention was concluded, admitted the justice of the reflection which the hon. Member seemed to wish to cast upon the Convention. He would, however, since the subject did not properly arise in the present debate, be content with asking the House not to assume the correctness of the statement which his hon. Friend had made, but to reserve its judgment. The Convention was made on the 24th of July. It had not yet been presented to the House. It was therefore, in his opinion, premature to discuss it at the present time. It would be presented to the House, and it would then be possible for the hon. Member, if he did not think the Convention satisfactory, to raise the question by Motion in that House. He believed that when the time arrived, and the Convention was fully debated, it would be felt and believed by the House to have been a very satisfactory arrangement of a most difficult and intricate question made with that great Power in Eastern Asia with which it was desirable, above all other Asiatic Powers, that this country should be on friendly and honourable relations. The hon. Member had referred to the question of trade in Thibet and on the frontier between Yunnan and Burmah, as well as to that of the claims of China. He would not follow the hon. Member into those matters; but he would say that when the time came when this Convention became a matter of discussion the late Government would be able to show that on all these, as on other points, the Convention was honourable and satisfactory to this country; that it did not recognize any suzerainty of China over Burmah; that it contained no suggestion whatever of the cession of Bhamo; that it opened up excellent prospects of improved trade between China and Burmah, and settled questions which might have been a source of great trouble, and even danger, to our Indian Dominions. It was, he believed, a Convention which that House might properly be asked to receive, and would receive, when its details were known with cordial approval.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) (who rose amid cries of "Divide!" from the Ministerial Benches) said, he quite understood the desire of hon. Members opposite to close the debate; but he and others near him contemplated taking part in it. The Secretary of State for the Colonies seemed to think they should not oppose the annexation because it had not been opposed by the late Liberal Government. But they were in no way responsible for what the Liberal Government did in the matter, for the annexation had been the result of the action of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) when Secretary of State for India; and though it was all very well to talk about the beauty of continuity of policy, he trusted that whatever Government was in power there would always be plenty of Members of that House ready to oppose these schemes of annexation. He could understand a war being necessary if a British subject were maltreated; but an annexation was a very different thing. When European nations went to war the victor was rewarded by an indemnity, and, perhaps, a portion of territory; but nobody ever heard of them quietly annexing the whole country. Such a thing would be considered monstrous if it were done in Europe; why, then, should it be done in Asia? He thought that Viceroys, even when they went out to India with the best intentions, were always in favour of annexation. The great Military and Civil Services by whom they were surrounded were always in favour of it, because it led in both cases to promotion. We heard a great deal about rebels; but against whom were these people rebels? They were a people struggling to be free. King Theebaw might not have been the best of Rulers; but, for his own part, it seemed to him that the rule of King Theebaw was infinitely preferable to ours, because, though he might have executed a few of his courtiers, he had not interfered with the feelings and prejudices of the people. Our conduct in that country had not been such as to be likely to win over the people. In consequence of it the country was now open to rapine on the part of Native robbers, while our soldiers were sent from village to village to punish the inhabitants by killing them and burning their villages. The only thing that would give us a right thus to annex a country would be the desire of the inhabitants of that country that we should do so. He knew of no other right, and he hoped the House would insist, notwithstanding the assurances of the Under Secretary of State for India, that before it was decided that Burmah should form part of the British Possessions of India we should in some sort of way consult the inhabitants, and arrive at a decision according to their wishes.

Mr. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.) contended that we were sending an Army and a host of officials to Burmah not for the better government of the Burmese, because the Burmese were able to govern themselves better than we could do, but to devour the substance of the people. He protested against any taxpayers being burdened with the expenses of an annexation for which he maintained there was no justification. In 1852, at the siege of Rangoon, our soldiers stabbed the wounded just as they did the other day in Egypt. Once more we heard of the Burmese wounded being stabbed whilst lying on the ground by direction of the superior officers of our Army. How long was such a scandal to continue? When conquered you intend to tax the blood of these people by an impost on chloride of sodium—common salt. In a vegetarian country good health could not be kept without salt. Hence the British Government taxed their salt, and consequently their blood. But what matter? Sure we hand those poor Burmese a Bible! It were laughable if not so sad.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) said, he thought the terms of the Amendment inconclusive. If they were to continue the annexation the war must be continued. They were brought into contact with an ugly difficulty, and he rejoiced that he was in no way responsible for the annexation. He believed that if the country had foreseen the expenditure of blood and treasure in Upper Burmah now going on it would not have assented to the annexation. They entered into these great transactions with too light hearts. The ruling motives for the annexation were of the most meagre and mean character. It could not be that the British people were not beginning to realize that the present responsibilities of India were most severe, and for this country cavalierly to enter upon increased responsibilities was unjustifiable, and must lead to increased financial difficulties. There were in India already sources of the greatest possible danger to this Empire. It was proposed to burden India with increased taxation; yet those who took any trouble to inquire into the condition of India financially and industrially were bound to admit that India was really the poorest country in the world. These annexations were of no value to the people of India. They were not called for by the people of India, and he held it was unjust and cruel in the last degree that additional taxation, however light it might be, should be placed upon the people of India. Our policy in Afghanistan had been defended on the ground that it was necessary to have a "buffer State" on the North-Western Frontier of India between ourselves and Russia. But in this case we seemed to be deliberately abandoning the policy of the "buffer State" and bringing ourselves into immediate touch with China. The House had been told by the late Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bryce) that in the Convention which had been concluded with China many difficult questions had been settled. That was all very well for the moment; but, at the same time, Russia had found in dealing with China how much better it would have been to have had a "buffer State" intervening. There remained the miserable motive—he could characterize it in no other way — of getting increased trade with Burmah after we had subjugated it. He was disposed to look with the greatest jealousy upon increase of trade which was brought about through the instrumentality of military force. Taking it on the very lowest ground, we had 10 years before us to be employed in the subjugation of Burmah. He did not hesitate to say that for a great many years after the subjugation was complete, the interest on the money expended in the process would swallow up a good deal more than the profits which would arise. In view of this annexation he desired to know what position we were to take with regard to other nations whom we undertook to criticize and rebuke when they acted as we were now doing ourselves, on motives of self-interest, without any regard to morality? He proposed to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) rather than that of the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith), because it more clearly indicated his view as to the unjustifiable character of the annexation of Burmah.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) said, Her Majesty's Government, when last in power, took action, which led to the present deplorable state of affairs in Upper Burmah; and having brought about the present disorganized condition of the people, they were going into action, like a certain colonel who commanded a certain regiment of "peacemakers," under a blank flag. The noble Lord the present Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible for the Burmese policy; it was he who insisted upon annexing the country against the wishes and the aspirations of the Burmese nation, and the result had been a state of anxiety and confusion utterly hostile to the interests of the people of Burmah. Therefore, he argued that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government, before going further and sending a large Army into the unhealthy swamps of Burmah, to make careful inquiries into the origin of the Burmese difficulty. He would ask, if the proposed war was to be carried on, who was to pay the piper? Was it proposed to make India pay? Why, the annexation was carried out in opposition to the wishes and interests of India. For his part, he did not take any very great interest in these foreign affairs, nor did the majority of the Party with whom he acted; but when he saw Her Majesty's Government going in for a system of gigantic land-grabbing in any part of the world, he considered it to be his duty, and the duty of his Party—whose existence was a continual protest against land-grabbing in their own country—to raise their voices, and to use all the power which they possessed against such a nefarious policy. He asked the Government to consider well before they took any further steps in this matter to enter upon a policy of examination and inquiry with regard to Burmah, so that they might discover some means of allowing these unfortunate people to govern themselves. The system of land-grabbing was the bane of English policy. Only the other day the English officials seized an island on which lived a lot of savages, because they were afraid Germany should be beforehand with them. For his part, he did not see why England, who was the greatest land-grabbing nation in the world, should be jealous of Germany. It was a policy of hypocrisy and murder — hypocrisy first, murder afterwards. Inquiry would show that this Burmese difficulty, like too many of our troubles, was largely due to the overbearing intolerance of English officials. The captains of Irrawaddy steamers, according to statements in French newspapers, dealt arbitrarily with Burmese passengers, and then the Burmese authorities naturally retaliated. The English treated every people with whom they came into contact with contumely and insult. The Japanese, the Hindoos, the Burmese, all civilized peoples, they called niggers, and they treated them as niggers. Was it, then, to be wondered at that these people hated us, and when opportunity offered tried to retaliate? This policy of subterfuge and hypocrisy and insult caused the English people to be hated all over the world; and he suggested to Her Majesty's Government whether it was not time to turn over a new leaf? If they inquired into this

Burmese Question, they would find there were two sides to it. The French newspapers were not always friendly to this country; but, at the same time, there was often very useful information for Englishmen to be found in foreign organs of public opinion. Anglo-Indian rule had been forced on the Burmese against their will; and, therefore, he asked the House, was it unreasonable to suppose that they would battle against the invader to the end? It was very easy to say that 30,000 troops would be sent to put those people down; but if they retreated to their hills and mountain fastnesses how could they be reached? The country was, at the present time, flooded; and after the floods, when the strong glare of the sun came out where the water had previously lain, the condition of the atmosphere would be highly unsanitary and dangerous to our troops.

Mr. SPEAKER rose to Order, and said that the hon. Member was not speaking relevantly to either Amendment.

Dr. TANNER, in continuation, said, it was a comprehensive assertion for any Member of Her Majesty's Government to make that, because we had gone in for the annexation of a country that did not care for us, and for which nine out of every 10 Englishmen would tell us he did not care a rap about, that all the expenditure was to fall upon India. Let England pay for it, because they were very fond, when they could, of trying to get up some petty war, or annex some State, be it large or small, to show that their foreign policy was so fine and great, and that they were carrying out the great foreign policy inaugurated at Berlin—the policy of peace with honour. If Her Majesty's Government insisted upon annexing Burmah this country should pay for the policy of annexation; and if they insisted on carrying on war in Burmah—and he supposed, if necessary, of exterminating the Burmese—they should make this country pay for their doing so; and then, when they came to deal with the people of this country, and put this foreign policy before them, they might, perhaps, be sorry. They had better pause in time. We heard a great deal about the dacoits. Who were the dacoits? It was understood that they were tribes of robbers infesting Burmah and the North-West of India; and when we looked into the question it was found that though they had existed in the North-West of India for a long time, they had never existed to the same degree as they did at the present time. Instead of these men being robbers, they were found to be practically the farmers and the country people of the district, up in arms, fighting for their faith, against a foreign country. Nobody in the world could say anything against them for so doing. One noteworthy fact struck him about the matter. Why was Burmah annexed? Was it because we particularly wanted to have Burmah? It was not. It was annexed shortly after the Franco-Burmese Agreement was under consideration. When the Burmese agents were in Paris for the purpose of concluding the Treaty, the Government received a whole shoal of official communications between Lord Lyons, Lord Granville, and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, dealing with the Franco-Burmese difficulty. Then why was the country annexed? Simply and solely because the Gentlemen who were at the head of the Government at the time began to get afraid lest France might get the upper hand of them in Burmah. In one of those letters, which he saw not long ago, from Lord Lyons to Lord Granville, the former made use of the remark that he had an interview with M. Jules Ferry, and had said to M. Ferry that it was all important for England to keep up good communications with Burmah—if necessary to annex Burmah—whereas it was only of secondary importance to France. The islands to which he referred were annexed the other day because Her Majesty's Government was afraid of Germany; and in the same way Burmah was annexed because they were afraid of France. This policy of fear always brought a policy of catastrophe in its train. As this policy of fear had brought all the disasters in Burmah in its train, so would just retribution bring about the punishment of the devisers of such an unhappy policy.

Mr. ALLISON (Cumberland, Eskdale) said, he thought the House should be obliged to the hon. Members who had brought these questions forward. He confessed he was in favour of both Amendments. He held the opinion that the annexation of Burmah ought not to have taken place at all; but, having taken place, that a portion of the charge ought to be borne by the British taxpayer. It was true that he was opposed in that opinion by both the Front Benches; but that was a very good reason for thinking that he might be right on that occasion. The annexation formed an admirable and complete example of the delusive promises and foolish anticipations by which these filibustering expeditions were palmed off on the British public, and it was in the hope that they might be wiser in the future that attention should be called to this most gross example. The annexation, instead of being followed by an increased trade, had been followed by stagnation of the ordinary trade of the country. Just before Parliament met six months ago, they had a long Memorandum from Colonel Sladen to the Indian Government, in which it was represented that "the general interests of humanity were infringed by the continued excesses of a barbarous and despotic Ruler." He was afraid "the general interests of humanity" had been infringed since then by others than a despotic and barbarous Ruler. The Natives who "gladly hailed our advent" had required 16,000 troops to enable them to express their feelings, and these now required to be increased to 35,000. It was abundantly clear that this question was not favoured by the Native people of India. It was admitted by Lord Dufferin himself, in his address to the Indian Government, that the Natives were hostile to the annexation. His Lordship added that they were imperfectly informed; but possibly their information was as good as his. Under such circumstances, it was unfair that the people of India should be saddled with the whole cost. The great argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman on the Front Bench (Sir John Gorst) was that the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had laid it down that the cost ought to be borne by the Indian people. The hon. and learned Gentleman was under a delusion, however, if he supposed that all the Members on that side of the House were the blind followers of the late Prime Minister. Occasionally they did think for themselves; and for himself, when this question was last before the House, he never gave a vote with greater pleasure than when he voted in the opposite Lobby to the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian on the question of the expenses of the annexation. While, however, the Natives were absolutely opposed, there were some bodies of people in this country absolutely in favour of the policy. Chambers of Commerce in the large commercial centres had taken a deep interest in it, and he thought that those commercial centres who highly approved of the policy of annexation ought to put their hands in their pockets to assist the Native people of India to pay for the policy of which they so approved. The final momentum having been given from this country, he submitted on this ground alone that this country ought to find some portion of the charge, and not fasten the whole on the unfortunate Natives, who were not represented in the House of Commons. The principle of no taxation without representation ought to be followed in the case of India; and when wars of this kind were initiated by our statesmen their cost should be defrayed by those who were represented in that House.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) said, he would like to call attention to the extraordinary fact that, though this question of a war in Burmah, involving the expenditure of possibly millions of money and the lives of a large number of men, was in debate, not a single Member of the late Government had spoken in regard to it, and the House had not heard one single word of justification from those who, until very recently, were entirely responsible for the conduct of affairs in that country. He entirely agreed with the remark of the Under Secretary for India that this was not a Party question, because, in his opinion, both Parties were equally responsible for the atrocities that had been committed all round our Indian Frontier, and nowhere more than in and around Burmah. He believed that policy had been adopted for greedy objects, at the instigation of the military ring which had involved India in so many wars. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer really anticipated that we should have great trouble in Upper Burmah, why did he estimate the expense of the war at the ridiculously low figure of £380,000?

Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said, he thought that, whatever views hon. Members might take respecting this debate, they might join in congratulating the House upon the attendance during the discussion of an Indian question, especially at that season of the year, and of the evidence afforded of a growing interest in the House on subjects affecting the happiness of the people of India. The hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had expressed surprise that no Member of the late Government had risen to express their view of the points raised by the Amendments. If he had waited a little longer, the hon. Member's desire for such a statement would have been satisfied. It was impossible for him (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth) not to feel a great deal of sympathy with much that had fallen from his hon. Friends on that side of the House; with the hon. Member for Flintshire's (Mr. S. Smith's) pleas for mercy to the people of India, because of their poverty; with the love of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) of a policy of peace; and with the hon. Member for West Bradford's (Mr. Illingworth's) objections to annexation. He was afraid that in the past there had been much too ready a tendency to fly to annexation as the solution of difficulties, when, perhaps, a better mode of solving them might have been found. He was not sure, however, that the mode in which his hon. Friends proposed to apply these principles to the present question would commend itself to the House. His hon. Friend the Member for Flintshire had spoken of the annexation of Upper Burmah, quoting from *The Voice of India*, as if it had been the policy of his right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). But this policy had been adopted, and the "permanent incorporation of the Kingdom of Ava in the Empire" had been announced in the Queen's Speech, before his right hon. Friend and the late Government took Office. And if any credit or responsibility attached to the initiation of that policy, it rested not with the Government of his right hon. Friend, but with their Predecessors. But the late Government deliberately decided that they would maintain that policy and take the necessary consequential measures. He had already justified this decision of the late Government, and he was ready to defend it again. His hon. Friend the Member for West Bradford had said that he had searched for the ruling motives which had led the Government to interfere, and that they were of the "meanest character;" and doubtless, he alluded to the "commercial reasons" which the hon. Member for Flintshire said had actuated their policy. He (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth) entirely agreed with the Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst), who had said that this was not a trade war, but an Expedition for the protection of the Eastern Frontier of India. It was from that point of view that it was of real value to the peace and security of the Natives of India, including Lower Burmah; and that was why, in the opinion of the late as well as the present Government, it was right that the taxpayers of India should pay the cost. The Under Secretary of State had referred to a speech made by his right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian on his (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth's) Motion last Session. In that speech would be found the real reasons, distinctly stated, why the late Government decided upon maintaining the policy of their Predecessors. A good deal had been said about the possibility of setting up a Native Prince. There was no doubt that if Lord Dufferin could have seen his way to setting up any Member of the Royal Family of Burmah he would have been extremely glad to adopt that course. Lord Dufferin discussed that question with the Government at home, and they had before them a list of the only possible Members of that Family; but against each of them there was some conclusive reason which rendered his adoption quite impossible. Lord Dufferin went to Mandalay with a perfectly open mind; and, although the permanent incorporation of the Kingdom of Ava had been announced by Lord Salisbury's Government in the Speech from the Throne, the Viceroy considered very carefully, at Mandalay, whether some course short of absolute annexation was desirable; but he was convinced by inquiry into the facts of the case on the spot, and recommended annexation as the only policy the Government could adopt under all the circumstances. The hon. Member for Flintshire said that the Indian people felt that if England chose to make war on Burmah, England should treat Burmah as a separate Dependency or Colony. That had been carefully considered. But his hon. Friend had entirely overlooked the fact that, for years past, a considerable surplus income had been derived by India from Lower Burmah, and that it was only fair that India should take her share of the burden also. His hon. Friend the Member for West Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) argued that the question whether India should pay the costs of this Expedition was not prejudged by the Resolution adopted by Parliament in February last. He could not agree to that view; because he had clearly stated, in moving the Resolution, that the late Government meant that India should bear the expense, and that they did regard it as a proper charge on the Indian taxes. He had not put it in any saving words, like those his hon. Friend had quoted, as having been used by his noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) on a previous occasion, when moving, as Secretary of State for India, a similar Resolution. He thought that the decision of last Session was conclusive, and that the House of Commons did recognize that the charge should be laid on India. It was, therefore, impossible for him and the Members of the late Government to support the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Flintshire. Coming to the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer), he was equally unable to support it. He hoped that the account given of the state of Burmah in past and present times by the Under Secretary of State for India would be considered by hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition Benches, and that they would not rashly commit themselves to the statement that the Native population of Upper Burmah had shown that they had no desire to live under British rule. He believed that there was a great deal of evidence to the contrary, and he would particularly refer to the way in which our troops had been received by the villagers and peaceful population of Burmah. The Viceroy had in no way stinted the civil and military authorities in Burmah; they had had everything they required; and vigorous measures would, no doubt, be taken to suppress disorders which had become chronic during King Theebaw's reign. In the interest of the peace of Burmah, and in the true interests of its population, he believed that it was the duty of England to go through with the policy adopted by successive Governments, to pacify the country as speedily as possible, and to bring it into such a state that the Burmese people might go about their business without fear of those bands of dacoits.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West) said, that the question now before the House should be dealt with by itself. The hon. Gentlemen who had moved the Amendments before the House were Gentlemen for whom he had a great respect. They had brought forward Amendments very carefully worded in a courteous and businesslike manner; and the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith) had been disposed of by the Under Secretary of State and the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken; but the question raised by the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) came under a totally different category. Under certain circumstances it might be wise, prudent, and right that this country should contribute certain expenses with regard to India. No doubt, if the Burmese War was an Imperial question, if it was for the great interests of the country, we should pay a certain portion of the expenditure; but if it was for the benefit of India alone, we should not do so. The present and the late Under Secretaries of State had disposed of that; but they had hardly dealt closely enough with the speech of the hon. Member for Shoreditch. That hon. Member felt, as did many others, that we should never go to war if we could possibly avoid it. He quite agreed with that; but there were times when we must go to war, and when it was fatal to the interests of the country not to persevere in a war which we had once undertaken. The hon. Member had talked disparagingly of *prestige;* but was *prestige* nothing in dealing with Eastern nations, or even with others? Should we not have been in a better position if we had not surrendered the Transvaal? He ventured to say there was no man who knew the position which we occupied amongst the nations of the earth who would not say that it was an unwise thing to surrender the Transvaal. If, having put our hands to the plough, we had turned back from this Burmese War, our *prestige* would have been greatly injured, and the interests of the country would have suffered in proportion. But he had risen, not so much to discuss the policy of this war as to say a few words upon the position of the Army in respect to it, and upon the manner in which the Army had been, and was being, dealt with. He would venture to say, and he believed that he was right in saying, as he did with great confidence, that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer was most anxious that a large and thoroughly efficient Force should be sent to Burmah in the first instance. But what did we do? What, in fact, did we generally do when we had to deal with such an undertaking as this Burmese War? We generally began by sending out a most inadequate Force when we had an undertaking of this or a similar kind to carry out, and what was the consequence of this method of proceeding? Why, the consequence was that we inflicted on the Army which was sent out in the first instance a series of heavy losses, almost amounting to disasters. We lost, at the outset, a large number of gallant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, who were ready to do, and who did do, their utmost to promote and maintain the best interests of their country, and the honour of the Army to which they belonged. Their efforts were, through no fault of their own, only partially successful; and then the survivors of them were most unjustly passed by, and left out in the shade and in the cold. Was it not so? Was it not true that when our first efforts were not attended with success—men who had done their duty under most trying and difficult circumstances—many poor fellows had lost their lives, and those who had survived had no notice taken of what they had done and suffered? Then we awoke to a sense of our error, and the inadequacy of the effort we had made in the first instance. A large Army was sent out at last; and then this large Army and its Commander received all the reward and all the honour of success, while the men who had borne all the heat and burden of the day, and had struggled vainly against the difficulties with which they had to contend, in consequence of the smallness of the Force to which they belonged, were treated with indifference, and often did not receive all that they deserved. Thus it had been in the case of this Army sent against Burmah. It had been broken up into detachments, which had been posted here and there, and sent to different parts of the country in such a manner that it could attempt nothing effective against the enemy, and could with difficulty hold its own. Through no fault of its own it had failed to perform the task we had set it to do—through our underrating the strength of the enemy, as it was our continual habit to do. Now, we were going to send out a larger Army, and one which he hoped would be adequate to the duty which we expected it to discharge. But he maintained that we ought always, in the first instance, to send out an Army which was able to cope with the difficulties it might be expected to encounter. He ventured to say that if we had carefully considered what we should have been called upon to do we should have dealt with this Burmese War in a very different manner from that in which we had done. Everyone must wish that an affair of this kind should be settled off-hand; nor could there be any reason to doubt that this war would now cost a great deal more than it would have cost had it been dealt with efficiently in the first instance. We should have best consulted both the interest of India and of England, and it would at the same time have been the most humane and merciful course, if we had, in the first instance, sent a thoroughly efficient Army. In that case, we should have had none of the heart-burning to which this war had given rise, nor should we have had to deplore the loss of so many gallant officers and men. He thought it right to say this much on the part of the Army, which had never disgraced itself or its country, but, whatever others might have done, had always, and under all circumstances, done its duty, and steadfastly maintained the honour of the British name.

Mr. SUMMERS (Huddersfield) said, he agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) in regarding the Burmese War as an unjust and unnecessary war, and in holding that we ought with all possible despatch to extricate ourselves from an untenable position. The arguments in favour of this Expedition might be divided into two classes. There were, in the first place, the arguments of the Gentlemen who had been described as the mercantile Jingoes. He did not mean to say that the Members of the late or the present Government would rightly be described by that phrase; but, on the other hand, he could not admit that commercial considerations had nothing whatever to do with the Expedition. The immediate cause of the Expedition was, undoubtedly, the dispute with the Bombay-Burmah Company, which came to a head in August last. We were sometimes told that King Theebaw put himself distinctly in the wrong by refusing arbitration; but what was the nature of the arbitration that was offered to him? It was an arbitration in which the Viceroy, who was practically one of the parties to the suit, was himself to appoint the arbitrator. On the admission of the Members of the present Government, who were mainly responsible for the war, commercial considerations had a great deal to do with their policy. The noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) said, on the 31st of December last, that if the Government of India had delayed action a situation would have been created in Upper Burmah most prejudicial to the commercial and political interests of the Empire; and the then Under Secretary of State for India (Lord Harris) stated in "another place" that the expedition and annexation were not undertaken solely with the idea of extending our mercantile enterprize. Therefore, it was clear that commercial considerations had a good deal to do with the course of our policy. Now, the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), speaking in that House last February, expressed his opinion that no man of weight and experience would deliberately contend that we should be justified in making any war whatever for the sake of trade. They were told, however, that this was not a trade war, and, consequently, some other pretext for it must be advanced. The pretext was the intriguing of the French in Upper Burmah. The unpardonable crime which King Theebaw committed was that he endeavoured to enter into trade relations with Italy and France. It was monstrous to enter upon a war for such a flimsy purpose as that of preventing an independent Sovereign from entering into trade relations with friendly European Powers. It appeared to him that this war was entered upon with a light heart. At the time when it was undertaken it was not anticipated that it would turn out to be so formidable an enterprize as now we knew it to be. The noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) now said he never expected it would be an easy matter; he never imagined that Burmah would be reduced to order except after a considerable period. That was the lanrguage now used by the noble Lord; but, in his despatch of December 31, he wrote—

> "The arrogance and barbarity of a Native Court, the oppression of British subjects, the hindrance to British commerce, the intrigues of foreign nations, are for ever terminated in Upper Burmah."

The noble Lord was precipitate in his language and also in his action. He behaved like a "young man in a hurry" on that occasion. Parliament was to meet on the 12th of January; but the noble Lord did not wait for the assembling of Parliament. He issued a Proclamation on the 31st December, and he seemed to imagine that merely by the issue of a paper Proclamation the whole of the difficulties by which we were confronted would disappear. Well, they had not disappeared. Even if the military operations were justified, it did not at all follow that we should do wisely in annexing the country. Opinions had been adduced in favour of the annexation policy; but he would refer to the argument of the Marquess of Ripon. The noble Marquess denounced the idea of annexation, and argued in favour of the establishment of a Native Prince. Whilst he (Mr. Summers) agreed with the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer), he likewise agreed with the latter portion of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith). He did not think that India ought to bear the whole cost of this war. Native opinion, as expounded in the Native Press, was decidedly against the enterprize. The war was undertaken for the purpose of promoting British trade and for the purpose of putting an end to the intrigues of a European Power. As his hon. Friend had argued, India was an extremely poor country, while we were one of the richest countries in the world. No doubt, the original estimate of the cost of the Expedition was £300,000; but the House knew how original estimates were accustomed to be multiplied in course of time. This war having been undertaken in part, at all events, for British and Imperial purposes, we ought to bear at least a portion of the charge. He would only add that he intended to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch, and, if that were defeated, for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Flintshire.

Mr. BURT (Morpeth) said, he was glad that the hon. Member for Flintshire had afforded the House an opportunity of discussing this important subject. In the course of the debate it had been said that the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) was one of those who believed that we should not go to war if we could possibly avoid it. He (Mr. Burt) quite agreed with that sentiment. He did not think that was a very extravagant proposition; and the war in Burmah was just one of those wars which might have been avoided. The annexation of Burmah illustrated very well the small power that the House of Commons and the constituencies had in the declaration of war and the annexation of foreign countries. At the end of the Session of 1885 they scarcely heard a whisper that anything unusual was taking place in Burmah; and yet when the new Parliament met they found it declared in the Queen's Speech that an immense territory as large as France had been added to the Dominions of the Queen. During the interval the country was in the throes of a General Election. The people of this country were preoccupied with their own local affairs, and they therefore had no opportunity of giving the attention which was necessary to this very important matter. Now, if the law was not violated by this annexation, it was very considerably strained. There were various pretexts offered. It was said, for instance, that a secret Treaty had been entered into between Burmah and the French Government. That, however, was entirely cleared up. Sir John Walsham, in a despatch addressed to the Marquess of Salisbury, declared that the Prime Minister of France had said that not only was the statement incorrect, but there was not a single word of truth in it. Other pretexts had been found; but the whole subject illustrated the fable of the wolf and the lamb. It seemed to him that if we made up our minds to annex a country we were sure to find some reasons sufficient for ourselves why the annexation should take place. What was the present condition of Burmah? Upon that point the hon. Member for Shoreditch read some very startling statements from *The Times* newspaper. *The Times* was not very squeamish with regard to annexation, and it was not at all likely to misrepresent anything that might be done in the name of the British Government. *The Times* had stated that, including the military police, we had in Burmah at the present time no fewer than 30,000 soldiers, so that it was quite evident the undertaking was likely to be much more serious than was anticipated in February, when the question was discussed by the House of Commons. What were the prospects? They found that the leading authorities differed as to what our prospects were. The Prime Minister declared in "another place" that the difficulty was likely soon to be settled; but the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer hinted in his speech the other day that 10 years might elapse before the pacification of Upper Burmah was accomplished. However that might be, it was quite evident that the position was a very serious one for the taxpayers of India, and even for the people of the United Kingdom. It had been said that some of the statements put forward in *The Times* with regard to the anarchy prevailing in Burmah were very much exaggerated. It was also said that affairs were now being properly administered in Burmah; but *The Times* correspondent stated that the administrative staff in the country was supplemented by officers drawn from the police force, telegraph, public works, and other offices, and that these gentlemen possessed little or no training or experience; and, furthermore, that the discontent occasioned by our presence in the country was prevalent among all classes. Now with regard to the question—a very important one, but still, in his opinion, a subordinate one—who was to pay for these military operations? He thought it would be very unjust to put the cost of the war upon the half-naked and half-starved peasantry of India. So far as could be judged from the Native Press, the Indian Native population were not favourable, but entirely adverse, to this war. Indeed, it was evident from the Blue Books that it was the Chambers of Commerce and the leading merchants of Liverpool, London, and elsewhere, who hounded on the Government in this policy of annexation. There was an old song to the effect that those who made the quarrels should be the only men to fight. He would like to see that principle adopted in practical politics. Those who made quarrels ought also to be made to pay for them. If a distinction could be made, Parliament ought, as far as possible, to throw the burden of the cost of this war upon the merchants of this country and those who took the initiative in encouraging the Government to pursue the policy of annexation in Burmah. He did not regard this question as a Party one. He opposed the Egyptian policy of the late Government. He was one of those who believed that even the late Prime Minister was not always right, though he thought he was more frequently so than any other political Leader. He regretted the right hon. Gentleman's attitude upon this particular question; but whatever might be the view of officials and ex-officials, he (Mr. Burt) was of opinion that the feeling of the masses of the country was against these perpetual aggressions and annexations. The hon. Member for Flintshire expressed some hopes as to the views of the men who had been recently enfranchised. He said they were honourable and conscientious and just. He (Mr. Burt) believed they were. He believed they possessed all the qualities attributed to them by his hon. Friend; but, unfortunately, they were preoccupied with their own struggle for existence, and could not give the attention which it was desirable they should to foreign affairs. They were sound at heart upon this and other matters; and he believed that with their increasing power and their increasing intelligence it would become more and more difficult for any Government, whether Whig, Radical, or Conservative, to pursue a policy such as had been pursued in Burmah and elsewhere. He believed that the newly enfranchised would do all they possibly could to prevent a repetition of unjust and unnecessary wars.

SIR JOHN SWINBURNE (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Perhaps there are not many Members of the House who were in Burmah during the last Burmese War. I had the good fortune, or the bad fortune, to be engaged in that country at that time. A more iniquitous war was never brought about, and it cost this country many millions of money, and the lives of many thousands of British soldiers. The hon. and gallant Member for Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) talks about the *prestige* which these wars gave to us. Now, the Burmese were a hard-working and industrious people at that time, and we have now brought them comfort and civilization in the shape of opium. We ask the people of India to pay for this Burmese War—a war brought on because we were jealous of a European nation making friendly Treaties with a friendly nation. What would right hon. Members on the Front Bench opposite say, or what would the English Press say, if Russia were to annex Persia? Yet the right of Russia to annex that country, in order to obtain a seaboard, is quite as good as our right to annex Upper Burmah. It was a pure trade question, and one of jealousy of the influence of other European nations. We were jealous of France and jealous of Italy—jealous of their entering into Treaties with Burmah, and in order to prevent them from doing so we annexed that great country against the will of her people. Some hon. Members talk about our *prestige.* The hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) has referred to the course we took in reference to the Transvaal War; but nothing has tended more to increase our power over the whole of Africa than the policy we pursued on that occasion. [*A laugh.*] Hon. and right hon. Members opposite may laugh; but I can tell them these things are discussed from one end of Africa to the other—from Algoa Bay in the South to Alexandria in the far North. The general belief that we will rule the country with justice and not by brute force, in my humble opinion, is diametrically opposed to the contention of the hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) that we lost *prestige* when we restored the Transvaal to the Boers. Now, I maintain that there was no glory to be won by retaining it. A great country like this could well afford to restore territory to a people whom we might have crushed like an egg-shell, within three months. The Boers were without troops and without guns; and in giving them back their own country, nothing conferred upon Great Britain greater power and *prestige* throughout the whole of Africa, Central, North, and South. There is a sort of telephone running among these semi-civilized nations, and our actions are flashed from tribe to tribe, so that every Native State is soon made aware of what has happened. In regard to the cost of the present Burmese War, it is preposterous to ask India to pay for it. Unfortunately, India, as a whole, has no Representative Government. Do you think that if India had a Parliament in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, it would propose to expend millions of the hard-earned money of a people, at present most heavily taxed, for the prosecution of a war in Burmah? That their taxation is excessive without any further addition to it, is shown by the fact that taxes are imposed not upon luxuries alone, but upon articles of necessity, such as salt. I would ask right hon. Gentlemen on both of the Front Benches, whether they think that if the people of India had a truly Representative Government they would have voted the money for this war? Having undertaken the war, the least we can do is to call upon the British taxpayer to contribute the greater portion of the cost. In my opinion, that is the only way to prevent these iniquitous wars of annexation. In that case, when this House is called upon to vote the money, every taxpayer in Great Britain and Ireland will know that he is paying the cost, out of his own pocket, of wars which can only be characterized as iniquitous and totally unnecessary—wars which are calculated to do us much more mischief among Asiatic nations than any loss of so-called *prestige*. I wish hon. Members could have heard, as I have, semi-civilized nations discussing what we call *prestige*. They say—"You call yourselves Christians, and you come among us with fire and sword, with friendly proclamations and loud assertions that your only desire is to protect us, and then you kill our people and burn our villages about our heads." Many years ago—in 1852—I was in Burmah, and I saw whole towns and villages all along the river-side burnt to ashes. Rangoon itself took three days to burn down, and the banks of the river were strewed with dead, and with the wounded who had been left to die. I regret to say that I saw with my own eyes, wounded men slashed about by our men before they were actually dead. The only way to prevent such wars in future is, to require the expediency of an aggressive policy to be discussed, in the first instance, by the House of Commons before the money is voted. If the policy of an aggressive war is not approved of, the money would not be voted, and the war itself would consequently be repudiated. Any Minister who involved the country in war without the sanction of the House of Commons should at once be superseded. When the Marquess of Ripon was Governor General of India, he did not advocate the annexation of Burmah; but, on the contrary, he has told us that he considered it entirely unnecessary. ["Divide!"] Hon. Members opposite are growing impatient; but I wish they could have had a little experience of these things—not merely an experience acquired through holding some office in a bureau in London, but a practical experience which is only to be gained by mixing among the masses of the Oriental people and hearing what the opinions of these so-called semi-civilized Natives are. In that case, it would be impossible for them to run away with the idea that these are matters of indifference which the Natives neither understand nor appreciate. For my own part, I believe that the only way in which we can maintain our rule in India is by impressing upon the Native population that we are animated by a deep sense of justice in our dealings with them.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I should not be a Radical, and I should be unworthy of the name of an Englishman, and I should certainly not be a true Representative of the Radicals of Camborne, if I did not enter my protest in this debate against the annexation of Burmah. I have the more satisfaction in entering a protest against the course which has been taken by this country, because I regard the war as iniquitous and immoral—iniquitous, in taking away the liberties of the people, and massacring them after we have done so; and immoral, because we propose to charge the cost of this iniquitous war upon the innocent masses of India. I have, therefore, great pleasure in entering the strongest protest in my power against the war, and I am in a position, further, to protest against the action of right hon. Gentlemen sitting on both of the Front Benches of this House. The electors of this country have discovered more than once that there is very little difference between Whigs and Tories; but there is one difference, at any rate, I am glad to say, between right hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House and those who sit on the other—namely, that when the horrible atrocities of which we have been guilty in Burmah were detailed to the House by an eye-witness, I did not observe that right hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House received the statements made to them with a laugh and a giggle. Unhappily, Sir, whether we described the starving condition of the Irish people, or the mutilated remains of those who have been tortured and massacred in Burmah and in other parts of the world, I always observe that smiles of self-complacency, and even loud shouts of laughter, emanate from the Benches opposite. [*Ministerial cries of* "Divide!"] Now, Sir, we have a feeble expostulation in reference to the proceedings of the late Government. [*Interruption.*] I am here in the execution of my duty just as much as hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, and if they choose to enter into a conspiracy of silence on this subject, I can assure them I shall not follow their example. I was about to say that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Clitheroe (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth) has offered a feeble expostulation for the misdeeds of the late Government. He began by describing the necessity which was felt in India for our proceedings, and for the trouble and anxiety which had been inflicted upon the Government. I always observe that those who have filled official positions never get much further than sympathy, but that when the time for action arrives, their courage, like that of "Bob Acres," oozes out at their fingers' ends. We have been told that the war has not been entered into for the furtherance of our trade and commerce; but when it was commenced, it was asserted over and over again that it was for the protection of our traders in Burmah. We have been told that the Earl of Dufferin went to Mandalay with an open mind; but, if so, he certainly did not keep it open long—on the contrary, he declared that annexation was the only course that could be adopted. The noble Earl, by the Proclamation he issued by telegraph before Christmas, made any other course than annexation impossible. It is because of those irreversible and irrevocable decisions which hon. Gentlemen on the Front Benches are so often talking about, and which are undertaken without the knowledge and sanction of the Legislature of this country, or without the people of India being able to utter one word in opposition, that we are determined to drag into light the evil deeds which have been perpetrated. We are told that the burden entailed by the war is not a large one, and that it is comparatively a mere fleabite. It is said that the cost will be some £300,000, and yet we are told that 35,000 troops are to be drafted to Burmah. Leaving out of account the horrible butchery which is likely to take place, the cost, instead of being £300,000, will, with far greater probability, reach £3,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Clitheroe said there was strong evidence to show that the Burmese loved us and desired our rule; but the right hon. Gentleman refrained from telling us what the evidence is upon which he bases that assertion. We have heard of an old play called *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, and it appears to me that this massacre of the Burmese might, in the same way, be called "An Old Way to Make New Friends;" and I should like to remind the right hon. Member for Clitheroe of the words used by him on the 22nd of February in this House, when he moved that the expenses of the Burmese War should be paid by India. On the 11th of November, 1885, the Tory Government had ordered a Military Expedition to Upper Burmah, and the right hon. Gentleman went on to express a hope—

> "That a system of administration might be introduced suitable to the peculiarities of the country and the people of Upper Burmah, and not burdensome in cost."—(3 *Hansard*, [302] 941.)

If that could have been done, it might have been all very well; but we know perfectly well that it is the old story. The officials of this country always talk of introducing a better system of administration, although, in most instances, the Native administration is much more suitable than our own. It is perfectly well known that the people of the Native territories are rising against us in every direction, and that they have not the least desire for our rule. [*Cries of* "Divide!" *and interruption.*] Hon. Gentleman opposite are, no doubt, very anxious to get away for the grouse shooting. I think it would be more advantageous to them if they crossed over to Ireland and studied some of the evictions now going on in Kerry. [*Cries of* "Question!"]

Mr. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington): I rise to Order. I wish to know if the hon. Gentleman is confining himself to the terms of the Amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman has been subjected to much interruption. I have no doubt that the hon. Gentleman will confine himself strictly to the terms of the Amendment.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I was about to draw the attention of the House to a point which has not yet been touched upon, and which I consider it my duty to call attention to. I desire to draw the attention of hon. Members to some of the opinions which have been uttered by the Native Press upon this subject. Much has been stated about the interests of Burmah, and of India, and I wish to give actual evidence from Indian newspapers to show what the people over there themselves think about it. I propose to quote a few passages which will amply corroborate all I say—namely, that the annexation of Burmah has been undertaken against the wishes of our Indian fellow-subjects; that the taxation which the war will involve is regarded as a grievous burden to them; and that it is contrary both to the interests of this country and to India that the war should have been undertaken at all. The first quotation I propose to make is taken from a letter in reference to the attitude and policy of the Earl of Dufferin, which appeared in *The Indian Spectator* of August 8th, and is written by a Hindoo gentleman known to be an ornament to the Native Press of Bombay. He writes—

> "There is no doubt that the present opinion of the Native public about Lord Dufferin is unfavourable. He is generally believed to be a mere *diplomat,*' and no statesman, much less a great one; and it is felt that while he has been trying to amuse the Indians with sweet words, he has been assiduously respecting the susceptibilities, if not advancing the interests, of the Anglo-Indians at the expense of the Indians."

That is what is said with respect to the present Viceroy of India. As to the evidence which I propose to lay before the House upon the general question—namely, whether Indian opinion is in favour of this and similar wars of annexation, I may say that the evidence I am able to give is not that only of the Native papers, written in the vernacular, but also of English newspapers, and, therefore, in quoting these extracts I cannot be accused of quoting simply the seditious utterances of Native writers. If I quote expressions of opinion from cultivated English journals circulating in all parts of India, I think I may claim to have made out a very strong case against the policy of the Government. *The Scinde Times,* an English bi-weekly paper published at Karachi, stated on the 17th of February—

> "That Theebaw was a bloodthirsty tyrant no one has ever felt inclined to dispute. But he was never accorded a hearing. What little he has been allowed to say, and what little has reached the public, contrasts strangely with the Blue Book estimates of his character. We are never tired of talking of the massacres of Theebaw; but can any statistics be found of the number of dacoits shot and otherwise sent to their last account since the British entered Mandalay on their mission of peace? The conquest and annexation of Burmah have been very easy; but neither its retention nor pacification can be quite so easy."

The Bengalee, an English weekly newspaper published at Calcutta, stated on the 20th of February—

> "Theebaw had every right to enter into negotiations with a Foreign Government. He was an independent Prince, under no Treaty obligations with the British Government to refrain from entering into such negotiations. In seeking the friendship of France he might have given cause of offence to the British Government; but even the British Government must admit that he was acting perfectly within his own right. . . . It is, indeed, a dangerous precedent to create, as was publicly asserted by Mr. Gladstone from his place in the House of Commons, to go to war upon the refusal of an offer for arbitration to bring about the peaceful settlement of a difference. Would England have gone to war, under such circumstances, with Russia or France? Probably not. The truth is the war against Theebaw was utterly without any justification."

The Mahratta, an English weekly paper published at Poona, contained the following passage on the 21st of February:—

> "Neither the dethronement and transportation of the King, nor the deportation of the Tinedah, neither the cruel and indiscriminate shooting, nor the visit of the Viceroy, has served to allay the fears of the Burmans or to restore peace to their minds."

So much for the talk about our soldiers being welcomed by them!

> "And the opposition of the so-called dacoits has assumed such dimensions that it has been found necessary to continue military rule for about a year more."

And probably for years longer! *The Indian Chronicle*, an English weekly paper published at Baukipur, of February 22, says—

> "Whether we consider the alleged atrocities and cruelties of King Theebaw, or the alleged loss of British commercial interest, we fail to discover any reason for the violent seizure of the territory."

The Behan Herald, an English weekly paper published at Baukipur, said on February the 23rd—

> "The recently published Papers fully justify the deposition of Theebaw; but they do not satisfy us that any action short of annexation would not have met the requirements of the case. The oppression of British subjects, the hindrance to British commerce, and intrigues of foreign nations, could have been effectually prevented by the establishment of a Protectorate."

The Indian Mirror, an English daily paper published at Calcutta, on February 26, said—

> "The Burmese Kingdom, though it may not have been a friendly or agreeable neighbour, had never given us any trouble which a small Military Expedition could not easily have put down. It was not required to strengthen our South-Eastern frontier, or to contribute to our material development."

Perhaps the House will now allow me to quote Native opinion. *The Anglo-Mahrathi* of February 28, a weekly paper published in Bombay, says—

> "The thing which strikes us as very strange is that the Liberal Ministry of Mr. Gladstone has consented to this act of spoliation."

The Indian Mirror of March 1, an English weekly paper published at Allahabad, says—

> "Yet the Government of India went out of its way to make the quarrel of a private trading Company with the Burmese King its own."

The Yezdan Parast-Gujarati of March 14, a weekly paper published in Bombay, says—

> "The resolution to incorporate Burmah with the Indian Empire will be very unwelcome to the Native public."

The Subasuchaka, of Satara, a Mahrathi weekly paper, of February 26, sees nothing but injustice in the Expedition to Burmah. This shows that Indian newspapers, with a prescience I do not see reproduced on the Opposition Benches, have all along argued in favour of Burmah being treated as a Crown Colony, like Ceylon, and have strongly protested against its being incorporated with India. Of course, these are mere questions of opinion, and it may be said that Native opinion is worth no more than our own; but, at any rate, what I insist upon is that these expressions of opinion should be taken into account in this House. Unfortunately, we have no Indian Representative here. When hon. Members, like my hon. Friend the Member for Lichfield (Sir John Swinburne), get up and speak of what they have seen and know, they only get laughed at for their trouble. As to the question of cost, I think I shall be able to show that the burden of taxation in India is already felt to an alarming extent, and that old prejudices are being aroused among the people against the imposition of this fresh burden. In *The Aftal-e-Panjaub* of March 10, an Urdu weekly paper published at Lahore, there is the following passage:—

> "What can India expect from the Indian Finance Committee? From one side famine is hanging over India, and, on the other hand, our Secretary of State is going to load tax-ridden India with 50 lakhs of rupees on account of the expenses in Burmah."

The Indian Courier of March 6, an English weekly paper published in Benares, says—

> "It seems, after all, that India must suffer. Manchester must be propitiated, the British Empire in the world must be enlarged and extended, markets for British Commerce must be found. And all these and more at the sacrifice of India."

And then, in reference to the question of cost — [*Cries of* "Divide!" *and* "Order!"]—I will only remind hon. Members opposite that they are setting a very dangerous precedent. With reference to the question of cost, because that is the principal question, *The Jam-e-Jawshed-Gujariti* of February 24, a daily paper published at Bombay, said—

> "The Resolution for throwing the expenses of the Burmah Expedition on India was passed without a division in the Lords! Being noblemen, these Members think the sum of 30 lakhs of rupees a mere bagatelle."

The paper might with truth have added that they are noblemen living in luxurious and idle ease upon the labour of their poorer fellow-citizens. This goes directly to the root of the whole question as to the amount of taxation per head upon the people of India, and whether it is fair to heap further burdens upon them. How many hon. Members in this House can stand up and say exactly what is the actual taxation and annual charge per head upon the people of India? [*Cries of* "Divide!" *and interruption.*] I think I have a right to claim a hearing when I am endeavouring to fulfil my duty by placing before the House not mere rhetorical devices, but actual facts. *The Hitechhee-Gujarati*, a weekly paper published at Ahmedabad, stated on the 4th of March that the average daily income in India is six pice. [*A laugh.*] I wonder whether the noble Lord opposite who sits for one of the Divisions of Lancashire (Viscount Cranborne) is able to tell me that six pice represent one-thirtieth of 2*s.*; and yet, although that average daily income per head is miserable enough, in all goodness, according to this paper—

> "The Indian pays 17 per cent of his income to the Government, besides meeting other calls on his purse in the shape of municipal, local funds, and other taxes, so that, on an average, a man has to pay to Government in India nearly 20 per cent of his income. Out of the annual average income per head of population, four rupees have to be paid to Government, and the remainder barely suffices for his wants. England increases the burden on such a poor country by needless expenditure."

The Nyaya Darshak-Gujarati, a weekly paper published at Ahmedabad, on the 8th of March says—

> "India can only bear her troubles like a patient beast of burden, and beg for her bread like a beggar."

And when a few of us do venture to get up in this House in order to call attention to the position in which the Natives of India are placed, an attempt is made to howl us down by inarticulate ejaculations. Is such conduct worthy of Englishmen? I only ask hon. Members to listen to the facts which I am placing before them. Another paper, *The Kesori*, a Poona Mahrathi weekly paper, of February 23 says—

> "The expenses of the Burmah War cannot justifiably be thrown upon India. India's interests never demanded such a measure, and, as it was undertaken for British commerce, why should India be made to pay for it? Such an unjust procedure will create general discontent and disappointment. The leaders of public opinion should direct their efforts to carry the universal protest to the doors of Parliament, and try to resist such an unfair measure."

[*Cries of* "Divide!" *and interruption.*] I would ask whether hon. Members really believe that when the report goes forth to India that when a few friends of that country in this House attempted to make the voice of India heard, they were met by such a childish manifestation of impatience? Recollect that India has no direct Representative in this country or in this House; and do you suppose that the discontent of the people of India will be one whit less because you refuse to listen to the facts of the case, or that you will better secure the loyalty of our Indian fellow-subjects? I am afraid that such conduct will one of these days meet with dire retribution, and that the day will come when, if we do not relieve the burden of the over-taxed people of India, there will be such a conflagration as the world has never witnessed. Passing, however, from that, for I have no desire to trespass unduly upon the attention of the House, and I feel great regret that I been compelled to detain it so long, I have one question to ask in reference to what was said by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Sir John Gorst) as to the future of Burmah. He has taken a very rosy view of the situation, and he says he has no fear of the ultimate result. He added, that as soon as the country is settled and a British Government is established, Burmah will be remunerative and will pay its way. I remember that precisely the same sort of thing was said about Cyprus; but it does not appear to me that hitherto Cyprus has paid its way, or proved in the slightest degree remunerative to this country. On the contrary, it has so far been a burden to this country, and a burden it is likely to remain. The same rosy view was taken of Egypt, and we all know with what result. It is all very well to talk of what may happen, and how remunerative Burmah may be when the slaughter of its inhabitants is at an end; but if we are to succeed in establishing a *vasta Romana* in Burmah, it can only be after we have reduced it to the condition of a *vasta solitudo.* Our proceedings in this matter, not only in respect of Burmah, but of other unfortunate but weak populations, have invariably been the same — we first massacre the best part of them, and then make drunkards of the rest. The true reason why the annexation of Burmah was undertaken, was not so much because Her Majesty's Government were afraid of the French, or had any sympathy for the oppression under which the unfortunate Natives had been groaning under the rule of King Theebaw, but because Manchester, Liverpool, and other places required new markets; because the spirit merchants of this country wanted more people to whom they could sell their fire water, and because the very promising young scions of our Nobility wanted additional openings for their appointment as Civil servants. Now, Sir, we in this part of the House venture to enter a strong protest against these proceedings. We have been reminded by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) of the *prestige* which we have to maintain. Hon. Members opposite always talk about our *prestige;* but I always observe that the people who talk most about *prestige* are those who say very little about morality. We are asked what is the use of raking up these matters now; that the thing is done, and that it is irrevocable, irreversible, and final. Unfortunately, that is true; but if I am forced to ask the question *cui bono?* the answer is plain and simple. So long as we are content to allow matters of this kind to go unchallenged, so long as we choose to allow hon. and right hon. Members below us to expostulate in a feeble manner against the proceedings of the Government, so long as we refuse to oppose actively the conspiracy of silence which prevails on the Benches opposite, so long will similar proceedings take place in other instances, which can end only in the disgrace of this country. It is not because we can reverse the decision that has been arrived at in this matter, but because we feel bound to do all that we can to awaken the conscience of the country, that we have been induced to discuss the question. It is because we believe that none but a Radical Government will ever succeed in putting a stop to these aggressive Expeditions—it is because we believe that it will not be until the Democracy of this country take the reins of Government into their own hands and dislodge both Whigs and Tories alike, and that that will be the only means of bringing home closely and pointedly to the British taxpayer the folly and cost of this policy of annexation, that we feel called upon to support the Amendment. Above all, we feel it is our duty to repudiate in the strongest terms what we regard as a deep stain upon the escutcheon of this country.

Mr. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.): Sir, as a new Member of this House I throw myself upon its indulgence. [*A laugh.*] If hon. Members opposite are not willing to give me that indulgence which is usually accorded to a new Member I am prepared to make my remarks without it. I have certainly risen with a considerable amount of feeling to take part in the debate, because I consider that the Under Secretary of State for India has made a most alarming announcement this evening towards the conclusion of his speech. I have the deepest sympathy with the Amendment of the hon. Member for Flint (Mr. S. Smith), and I am still more strongly in favour of the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer). I listened with the most careful attention to the speech of the Under Secretary of State for India in order to see if I could find in it anything like a justification of the policy of the Government with regard to Burmah. What was the purport of that speech? It was the same old story that we have heard over and over again. First of all, that we were going there to secure the better administration of the country, and next, that the people were willing and anxious to receive us. In point of fact, we have been told that they were almost waiting with open arms to receive us; but it seems to take a long period before we are able to bring them to realize the value of our civilizing influences. We have been for a considerable number of years endeavouring to teach Native troops, not only in India, but elsewhere, the great advantages of our form of government; and what is the present condition of Burmah after the effort we have made to introduce into it European civilization? The hon. and learned Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India has admitted, among other things, that at the present moment there are five Native Princes wandering about the jungle of Burmah, each with a small following, in open hostility to British rule, to say nothing about pretenders. On behalf of the dacoits, it cannot be denied that they represent the feeling of a large part of the country; and, at any rate, it cannot be said that they represent the people who are prepared to receive us with open arms. If I am not misquoting the hon. and learned Gentleman, he stated that no Government would be willing to add more territory to the enormous Dominions we possess already. If that be so, the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government is a most peculiar way of endeavouring to prove their anxiety not to acquire extra territory. It seems to me that there is scarcely a Government that comes into power, representing either of the political Parties in this country, that does not annex some portion of the globe to our already enormous territory. I am one of those who believe that we have such enormous territories already, that all the energy and ability we may possess should be devoted to the development of their interests instead of neglecting them in order to look after other people in other parts of the world. We were told, of course, that this war with Burmah was to be a very little affair—a small Military Expedition that would soon be settled. Nevertheless, the war is still going on, and has been in progress for some months. A large amount of money has already been spent, and my hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) told us that something like 30,000 troops, according to the authority of *The Times*, were already in Burmah. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India tells us that there are not 30,000 troops there now, but only some 15,000 or 16,000; but the hon. and learned Gentleman said nothing of the military constabulary to which my hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) referred. Although the hon. and learned Member did not admit that there are 30,000 troops there now at the present moment, he did inform us, before he resumed his seat, that as soon as the cold weather sets in, if the Government had not 30,000 troops there now, they were prepared to send 30,000, or even more, if required. Are these proceedings that a Government is expected to take towards the people who are longing for them to come and deliver them from the tyranny to which they have been subjected in the past? But this is not all. The hon. and learned Gentleman told us that besides 30,000 troops there is a flotilla of boats, and a fleet to take them down to Mandalay. The hon. and learned Gentleman even told us the number of boats that compose the flotilla; and certainly it gave us the impression that it did not look very much like a small Expedition to suppress a few robbers who are wandering in the forests of Burmah, but that it is rather a gigantic preparation for war in which we expect to meet a people who are determined to make a great struggle to be free. With such a prospect before us we have a right to feel some little alarm. He who has raised the alarm is the hon. and learned Gentleman the Under Secretary of State himself in the speech which he has just delivered. After that speech, we are fairly entitled to say—"When is this war in Burmah going to end, and what is it to cost the people of this country?" I quite agree with the hon. Member for Flint (Mr. S. Smith) that we should be prepared to pay our share of the cost. I do not think it is right that the unrepresented millions of India should have to bear all the cost, and, at the same time, I do not consider that I am bound by the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), much as I respect that right hon. Gentleman. Nor is this the only instance in which I have objected to his policy, for although not then a Member of this House, I felt bound to oppose his Egyptian policy outside Parliament. My hon. Friend the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) and myself have been consistent in the policy we have adopted, and we adopted it against the Leaders of our own Party. Where, I ask, is this policy of aggressive warfare to terminate? No one can look with satisfaction at the prospect of placing additional burdens upon the already overtaxed people of India, or at the prospect of increasing the charges upon the people of England; and with the knowledge I possess of the condition of the working classes, both in the agricultural districts and in the towns, I feel convinced that, instead of imposing additional burdens upon them, something should be done to relieve them of some of the burdens which they bear already. I represent an industrial population, and I know what they had to suffer in the past winter, and what they may have to fear in the winter which is approaching. Whatever may be the case with the hon. Members opposite, they will find it impossible to smile when they realize the prospect before them if this Expedition is to go on, and this enormous cost is to be incurred. Whatever theories may be entertained here, we shall be bound to relieve the people of India of a portion of the charge, because it will be found far too heavy for them to bear alone. We have heard and read much of Expeditions to civilize other people throughout the world. It is a peculiar thing that, whether it is England or any other Power who think that some other portion of the world requires to be civilized, they usually try the experiment on some nation not quite so strong as themselves, and who are less proficient in armaments and in the arts of warfare. A short time ago we had to go outside the Himalaya mountains in order to civilize certain people. Fortunately we had got away from that difficulty now; but not many years before we had set ourselves the task of civilizing the tribes on the other side of the Himalayas. And so we go on. What I want to see is a stop put to this policy of annexation, and I shall have great satisfaction, therefore, in voting to-night for the Amendment. Whatever may happen in the future, my conscience will be clear, because I shall have raised my humble voice by way of protest against the continuance of this policy of annexation, no matter what Ministry may be in power.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): Before the House goes to a division it may be convenient that I should just state the way in which the Government will treat these two Amendments, because sometimes where there is an Amendment upon an Amendment it becomes a little confusing to the general body of Members to know the exact way in which they ought to vote. The Government will vote "aye" on the first division, the effect of which will be, if the majority be "ayes," to negative the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer). Then the Government will vote "no" in the second division, the effect of which will be, if the majority be "noes," to negative the Amendment of the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith).

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 201; Noes 125: Majority 76.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Question put,

"That the words 'This House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India' be added to the Main Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 125; Noes 199: Majority 74.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Asquith, H. H.
Balfour, Sir G.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Burt, T.
Caine, W. S.
Cameron, J. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Chamberlain, R.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Coghill, D. H.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Crawford, D.
Cremer, W. R.
Crilly, D.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. H. G.
Esslemont, P.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Fuller. G. P.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gourley, E. T.
Gray, E. D.
Gully, W. C.
Harrington, E.
Harris, M.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Hunter, W. A
Illingworth, A.
Jacoby, J. A.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, M. J.
Lacaita, C. C.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, H. L. W.
Leamy, E.
MacInnes, M.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Mason, S.
Molloy, B. C.
Montagu, S.
Morgan, O. V.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Doherty, J. E.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Parker, C. S.
Pickersgill, E. H.

Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Plowden, Sir W. C.
Power, P. J.
Provand, A. D.
Quilter, W. C.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Reid, R. T.
Reynolds, W. J.
Rowlands, J.
Rountree, J.
Russell, E. R.
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Shirley, W. S.
Sinclair, W. P.

Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Tuite, J.
Warmington, C. M.
Watson, T.
Watt, H.
Will, J. S.
Wilson, H. J.
Wright, C.

TELLERS.
Buchanan, T. R.
Smith, S.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Asher, A.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Baumann, A. A.
Beadel, W. J.
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Coddington, W.
Cohen, L. L.
Commerell, Adml. Sir J. E.
Corbett, J.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Col. hn. L. P.

De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Feilden, Lt-Gen. R. J.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitz-Wygram, Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fulton, J. F.
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Grimston, Viscount
Grotrian, F. B.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Heath, A. R.

Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Kay-Shuttleworth, rt. hon. Sir U. J.
Kelly, J. R.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lees, E.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, right hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Arthur, W. A.
Mallock, R.
Marjoribanks, rt. hon. E.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.

Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Murdoch, C. T.
Noble, W.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Powell, F. S.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Russell, Sir G.
Salt, T.
Sandys, Lieut-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Capt. C. W.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Smith, D.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Taplin, T. K.
Taylor, F.
Temple, Sir R.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Townsend, G. F.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Webster, Sir. R. E.
Webster, R. G.
Weymouth, Viscount
White, J. B.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wilson, Sir S.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Dr. Clark.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I do not think that hon. Members can suppose for a moment that the Government can consent to the adjournment of the debate on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne at so early an hour as 12 o'clock. I cannot conceal my own opinion, and I do not think I should be right if I were to conceal my opinion from the House, that the proceedings this evening, so far as they have been shared in by hon. Gentlemen opposite, have not been conceived with a view to the public advantage. [*Loud cries of* "Oh!" "Withdraw!" *and* "Shame!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. The noble Lord has just stated that the proceedings this evening have not been conducted with a view to the public advantage. That, Mr. Speaker—[Several hon. MEMBERS: Conceived!] Well, "conceived with a view to the public advantage." I do not think it makes much difference. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that expresses on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer an imputation of motives to hon. Members on this side of the House—namely, that they are inspired by motives not to the public advantage, and that, Sir, I submit to you, is a breach of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: There has been no breach of Order. The expressions of the noble Lord were couched in Parliamentary form, and I can take no exception to them.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I say, Sir, have not been conceived with a view to the public advantage, or with a view to the despatch of the Business of the House of Commons. Her Majesty's Government can take no responsibility for these proceedings on the part of hon. Members opposite. On the contrary, they deem it to be their duty, by their action with regard to them, to draw public attention to those proceedings in a marked manner; and certainly, if anything would intensify the character of these proceedings, it would be a Motion for the adjournment of the debate at so early an hour of the evening. Under these circumstances, Sir, I have, in reply to the hon. Member (Dr. Clark), to say that the Government strenuously resist that Motion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.): As one of those who have taken some humble part in the discussion this evening on the very important question of the war in Burmah, I wish to repel with the greatest plainness the imputation which the noble Lord has hurled at this side of the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says the proceedings have been conceived in opposition to the interests of Public Business. All I can say is I am delighted that the noble Lord is appealing to public opinions outside this House. Whatever may have been the verdict of the country on one question, I am quite satisfied that the majority of the people of this country are not favourable to the views of the noble Lord. But for the noble Lord to undertake to flagellate this side of the House for the course we have felt bound to take from as pure a sense of duty as anything the noble Lord ever attempted wherever he happened to sit in this House, seems to me very like a case of Satan correcting sin. ["Oh, oh!" *and cries of* "Order!"] The noble Lord himself has set the most extraordinary examples of using the Forms of this House, and even abusing them, for delaying the Business of the House on numberless occasions, and at times, too, when he was not able to carry with him more than three or four of his personal Friends. I repel, again, with all necessary warmth, the imputation of the noble Lord.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I think it is fair to remark that the noble Lord is in the habit of treating this House with contempt. I can only say upon that that we return the compliment. I wish to ask, Sir, whether it is not the fact that the noble Lord or one of his Colleagues, at the commencement of the Business of the evening, stated that the Government were desirous to proceed with the Bill in connection with the disturbances at Belfast, provided the debate on the Amendment to the Address were concluded in time; whether a Blocking Notice has not been placed against that Bill, whereby it cannot be taken after half-past 12; and whether, if this discussion lasts another 25 minutes, it will not be impossible to go on with the Bill? I ask, Sir, whether, in view of these facts, we are open to the imputation which has been cast upon us by the noble Lord, and whether there is just ground for saying that an attempt has been made to bring about the adjournment of the debate on the Address at too early a period of the evening?

Mr. LIONEL COHEN (Paddington, N.): I hope I may be permitted to say one or two words from the Back Benches on this (the Ministerial) side on this question. We have been told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that it is too much in the fashion of the Front Benches to settle these questions amongst themselves. I hope some consideration may be given to the opinions of hon. Members on the Back Benches on both sides of the House; and, speaking for my hon. Friends around me, I have to say that we have been accustomed to stay here till 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, and that we shall have the greatest pleasure in doing so again, if by that means we can expedite the Business which the House was called together to transact. I hope the noble Lord will remain firm in his resolution, and I am sure he will have the support of the majority of the House in getting through the Business we were called together this evening to dispose of.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): This is not the first time we have witnessed scenes something like the present; and on many previous occasions it has been my lot to act in co-operation with the noble Lord, when the Benches opposite were occupied by the Liberal Party. But, Sir, I must say I witnessed with perfect astonishment the performance of the noble Lord this evening. He certainly gave us to understand that the Government expected to reach such a stage in public proceedings to-night as would have admitted a certain Bill being taken which they know to be blocked, and which, therefore, they know must, to enable it to be proceeded with in its present stage, be reached before half-past 12 o'clock. I have been remaining here in the House mainly because I wished to hear the speech of the Member of the Government introducing that Bill. I wished to learn something of the scope and character of the Commission which it is proposed to appoint. But the noble Lord made use of language with regard to the proceedings of this evening which I, as one who ventured to take a small part in them, am inclined to resent. He said our proceedings were not conceived in the interest of Public Business or for the public advantage. He washed his hands and the Government washed their hands of all responsibility. Well, naturally the responsibility did not rest with the Government. It rested with those who initiated a discussion they thought it their duty to initiate. A disclaimer was not needed at the hands of the noble Lord; but, Sir, with regard to the question of adjournment, is it not perfectly plain that it would be only reasonable to adjourn now, because the hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion for Adjournment is in charge of an Amendment of much importance—one that any Member who has at all watched the progress of the Crofter Question must be anxious to listen to, and one which the hon. Member cannot be expected to bring on at this hour of the night, for it would not be possible to conclude the discussion on it to-night? If the Amendment were now moved before very long the debate would have to be adjourned, and it would necessarily have to be adjourned. It would be much wiser to let the hon. Gentleman bring on his Amendment as other hon. Members have been allowed to do after Question time at an ordinary Sitting of the House. But it is perfectly impossible for the debate on the Address to conclude to-night; because after the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman who has moved the adjournment is disposed of there is another Amendment to be discussed. It is evident that nothing like a satisfactory conclusion to the Address can possibly be effected at this Sitting. There must be an adjournment, and I appeal to the experience of the noble Lord whether the Government, recognizing that there is a considerable section of the House who are distinctly of opinion that the Motion for Adjournment ought to be acceded to, do not think it would be better in the interest of the dignity of the Government itself to concede at once that which they will have to concede in the long run—whether it would not be better to commence the Session, so far as this debate on the Address is concerned, with something like friendly feeling, and not exasperate such Party feelings as may have already been aroused? The noble Lord knows as well as I do that if there are 70 Members in the House who mean to have an adjournment no Government can prevent them from effecting their purpose. I do trust the noble Lord will withdraw his opposition and allow the debate on the Address to be adjourned until to-morrow.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I venture to hope that not only will the noble Lord withdraw his opposition to the Motion for Adjournment, but that he will see some reason to modify the language he has used. I cannot think that even hon. Gentlemen opposite will deem one night's discussion too much on a question affecting not merely the happiness of the people of the Kingdom of Burmah, not simply the great outlay which will have to be defrayed out of the Revenues of India, but huge responsibilities possibly in connection with this country. I cannot think that any reasonable man can hold that one night's debate has been too much for that, nor do I think that the people of India, weighing his words, will think it fair of the Leader of this House to put it that these grave matters should not occupy a few hours of our attention.

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.): As a Scotch Member, I wish to say one or two words before we proceed to a division, if a division should be necessary, on this subject. I would call attention to the fact that the Amendment to be proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) raises the question that the administration of the law in a certain part of Scotland does not possess the confidence of the people. I should like to know how it is possible to raise a more serious or a more important issue before the House than that of the confidence of the people in the administration of the law; and yet, according to the doctrine laid down by the noble Lord, at a quarter-past 12 at night, when it is utterly impossible for the Scotch papers to report the proceedings, and for the people of Scotland to be made acquainted with the proceedings of the House, my hon. Friend is asked to commence that which must necessarily prove a long discussion. Sir, the people of Scotland will take note of the interest which the noble Lord takes in Scotch matters. I regard the opposition offered to the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate as nothing short of an insult to the people of Scotland.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): I hope, Sir, that the noble Lord will not press the argument that he has recently used in favour of resisting the adjournment. I will make a suggestion to the noble Lord. The second Order of the Day is the Government Bill to empower the Commissioners who are to inquire into the Belfast disturbances to take evidence on oath. Now, if the noble Lord perseveres in the course he has now entered upon, it is quite clear that that Bill cannot be reached to-night. If, however, the noble Lord will give way, and will allow us to adjourn the debate on the Address, we shall be able to take the Bill in question and make progress with it. If the noble Lord does not give way, it is perfectly clear that nothing will be gained by the Government.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Mr. Speaker, I think it must be obvious to the House that our first Business is to make progress with the debate on the Address. We have now reached the eighth day of the debate; and I do not think that in any House of Parliament it would be considered unreasonable, when a Member rises at 12 o'clock at night to move the adjournment of the debate, that he should be expected to make his speech. I do not think the hon. Gentleman the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) has anything to complain of in that respect. He has less reason to complain than anybody else, because his Amendment was first on the Paper, and he might have taken advantage of his position and brought forward that Amendment long ago if he had pleased. But, having lost that position, I do not think he or anyone can complain if he is called on, on the eighth night of the debate, to introduce his Amendment at 12 o'clock at night.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): I think, Sir, though I cannot object to all that has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed the House, that there is no great force in his argument. My hon. Friend the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) has lately been absent from the House. I see no point in the observation that because he could have moved his Amendment long ago he should be compelled to do so now. The tone adopted by the right hon. Gentleman was certainly to be preferred to that of the noble Lord who would, I think, have done more wisely —— [*Cries of* "Question!"] When hon. Members who are interrupting me have been as long in the House as I have they will know I am speaking to the Question—I say the noble Lord would have done more wisely if, instead of opposing the adjournment, he had confined his attention to the despatch of Business, and had not taken it upon himself to attribute equivocal or blameworthy motives. Hon. Members on this side of the House do not come here to earn the approval of the noble Lord; they do not expect to receive it, and when they receive it it affords them no pleasure. I must say I am surprised at the course taken by the Government. The second Order on the Paper is their Bill dealing with the Belfast riots, and I certainly regard that measure as one of urgency. I inquired at Question time whether they intended to proceed with it? I thought that if the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) did not make his Motion the Government would take the second Order.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I think, Sir, that the Government would have acted in a more sensible way if they had agreed to the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate. I believe that the opinion of the Earl of Beaconsfield was that when there was a minority of 50 or 60 in favour of an adjournment it was useless for the Government to resist the Motion. In the present case there are, at least, 100 Members in favour of the adjournment of the debate; and I would point out that the Government may find themselves engaged in a lengthy wrangle, and in the end have to give way. The argument put forward by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope) is that the desire of Her Majesty's Government is to force on the debate on the Address; but does he imagine that the cutting short of the debate on the Address will really close the mouth of the hon. Member for Caithness, or of my hon. Friend near me, or that they will be prevented thereby from bringing forward these matters at a later stage? I am quite sure that my hon. Friends would not be satisfied with saying a few words only with regard to their Motions on the present occasion; and I think the Government are taking a very unpolitic step in trying to force them into that position. If the noble Lord is going to remain the Leader of the House he will require to be on decent terms with as many hon. Members as possible; and it will, therefore, be detrimental to his political interests to get into a squabble with a large number at the commencement of the Session.

Mr. MOLLOY (King's County, Birr): I have on so many occasions helped the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Motions for Adjournment that I will recall to his mind——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Motion for Adjournment.

Mr. MOLLOY: Sir, I will not pursue that subject. My only intention was to point out to the noble Lord that it is useless to get into a wrangle to-night. The intention of my hon. Friend (Dr. Clark) is to move an Amendment to the Address having reference to the state of affairs in parts of Scotland; and, as has been pointed out, to compel him to bring forward his Motion at a time when the arguments and remarks upon the question cannot be conveyed to the people of Scotland through the Press would be very hard. Now, as a matter of common fairness, I think the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate ought to be agreed to by the Government. We have had a little show of discussion on Ireland, and a short discussion this evening on Burmah. I came down to the House to-night ready to speak on the latter question, and have spent a considerable time in studying in *Hansard* the debates which have taken place with reference to it. I gave way, however, and did not speak; and, therefore, when the noble Lord charges us with obstruction, I think I have said enough to show that he is in error. Seeing that the affairs of Ireland and Burmah have been discussed, I do not think it fair that Scotland should not have an innings. The noble Lord has often appealed to the Government on former occasions to yield with a good grace; and, with his great experience of past Governments, I ask him whether it is worth while to persist in his opposition to-night? The Government have their second Order to go on with, and they have yet three minutes left to decide in. I shall only occupy one of them. I have been in so many of these wrangles that I have come to look upon them with horror and detestation; and, although I am ready to fight the Government in every way and on every point when necessary, I think it better to do so on friendly terms, and therefore I appeal to the noble Lord to withdraw his opposition to the Motion of the hon. Member for Caithness, and allow us to go home to bed.

Mr. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I wish to point out in reply to the statement of the noble Lord that, together with Friends who promised to support my Amendment, I endeavoured to induce the hon. Member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith) to give way, or to come to an arrangement by which one Amendment only should be moved in order that the time of the House might not be unduly taken up by having two divisions. You, Mr. Speaker, will bear me out in saying that I consulted with you as to making the two Amendments into one. That being so, I think we stand acquitted of the charge which the noble Lord has brought against us of having wasted the time of the House.

Mr. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): I was myself desirous that the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) should bring on his Motion to-night, and should not have said one word now were it not for the language of the noble Lord. I have spoken with several Members interested in the discussion with regard to Burmah, and I cannot conceive anything more unnecessary than the charge that those Members were engaged in a way that was not conducive to the public advantage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is not confining his remarks to the Question of Adjournment.

Mr. ESSLEMONT: Of course, Sir, I bow to your ruling, and have only to say that it is not in our power to give way on the Question of Adjournment, after the manner in which the noble Lord has characterized the action of those Members who have taken part in the discussion.

Mr. O'HEA (Donegal, W.): I am not one of those against whom the imputation of the noble Lord is levelled, because, although I intended to take part in the debate, there were so many speeches addressed to the Chair that I considered that my quota could be dispensed with. I think that the noble Lord, in referring to the Motion next to come forward, used an argument that tells somewhat against himself; because it will be in the recollection of the House that a few evenings since the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), having moved the adjournment of the debate, was not in his place when the debate was resumed; and at a late hour, when several hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House were prepared to speak, the right hon. Gentleman was called for vociferously by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not confining his remarks to the Question before the House. I must ask the hon. Member to address himself to the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate.

Mr. O'HEA: I shall certainly obey your ruling, Sir. It is most unreasonable that a discussion, which will be a protracted one, should take place at this hour—a discussion which, perhaps, would not be concluded before 6 o'clock in the morning. The people of Scotland are interested in the Motion of the hon. Member for Caithness; the question involved comes home to them, and it is one which this House cannot possibly lose sight of; and any attempt to hurry on the discussion would not be regarded favourably by the people of Scotland. Therefore, I trust that the request urged upon the Government will be yielded to, and that the House will be spared the long discussion which must otherwise ensue.

Mr. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): With regard to the language of the noble Lord, I say that, coming from one lately sitting on this side of the House, it was very surprising. I have remained in the House all the evening while the noble Lord was outside.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 122; Noes 197: Majority 75.—(Div. List, No. 6.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Mr. Speaker, unless my ears have very greatly deceived me, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer complains of Members on this side of the House having wasted the time of the House. Is the noble Lord not aware that in the Parliament before last debates on the Address lasted very much longer than the present debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has already spoken.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I was going to move the adjournment of the House, not of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman has already spoken, and cannot speak again.

Mr. PICTON (Leicester): I believe I shall be in Order in moving the adjournment of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question is——

Mr. PICTON: I wish to say that the noble Lord should bear in mind that it is not only the Business of this night or this morning that is concerned, but that of other days to come. The proceedings of an Assembly like this are very greatly facilitated by a little courtesy; and I can assure the noble Lord that his manner of dealing with us this evening is scarcely calculated to promote Public Business. I earnestly hope that the Government will consent finally to the adjournment of the proceedings in one shape or the other. If we cannot have the adjournment of the debate, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr Picton.*)

Mr. R. T. REID (Dumfries, &c.): I speak upon this Question with great reluctance, because I have never yet spoken on the Question of the Adjournment of the House or of the Debate, and I am as much opposed to obstruction in this House as anyone can possibly be. In the capacity of a Scottish Member I make an appeal to the noble Lord, who must be very much changed if he is not amenable to a reasonable proposition that is put before him in a matter of this kind. Is it wise to press the resistance of the House upon a question affecting Scotch Members and Scotland when it is well known that Scotch Members never obstruct the Business of the House, and always try to discuss temperately and fairly the matters that come before us affecting our country? I would not say one word in reference to the recriminatory matter that has been introduced into this question. I appeal to the noble Lord on the ground that I believe he is amenable to reasonable proposals; and I ask him whether it is not better to accede to the request of the Scotch Members in reference to a matter deeply affecting Scotland, and so much thought of in that country, and whether he does not think it would be consistent with progress of Business, and with the dignity of his own position and the side of the House he represents, to listen to our request, and give us a chance of reasonably and shortly discussing matters affecting Scotch interests at some more convenient hour than 10 minutes to 1 in the morning?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Member could hardly have made the appeal to me in the terms which he has if he had been present throughout the whole of the evening. [Mr. R. T. Reid: I have been.] I thought I was justified in assuming that he had not. I also will appeal to the hon. Member, who was in the Parliament from 1880 to 1885, whether he recollects a single case of the Government agreeing to an adjournment on an important debate when the adjournment is moved at 12 o'clock? I know of none departing from that matter. I cannot at all resist the seductive appeal of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton). I greatly grieve that he should have thought that in the performance of what I believe to be my duty I was wanting in courtesy either to him or any other hon. Member. But this I would say. During my Parliamentary experience I have never known an insinuation of dilatory action on the part of a certain section of the House urged in gentler terms than those which I studiously employed; and I challenge any hon. Member below the Gangway, knowing, as I well do, their ingenuity, to find a more ingenious euphemism for anything that may be supposed to insinuate that dilatoriness rather than expedition was aimed at than that—

> "I doubted whether the proceedings this evening had been conceived with a view to the public advantage."

Having said this much in my own defence, I will add that I am perfectly aware of the rights of the minority and of the power of the minority, and it certainly would not be my intention to deny the one, or unnecessarily to defy the other. That being so, and the Government having made what they consider to be an absolutely necessary protest in the interests of Public Business, they will not consider it necessary or desirable to oppose the Motion for Adjournment further.

MR. PICTON: I wish to withdraw my Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. A. Sutherland,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I desire to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can inform the House in what order he proposes to proceed with the Estimates?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I will endeavour to answer the Question to-morrow if repeated.

MOTIONS.

SECRET SERVICE (REPEAL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jackson, Bill to repeal the enactments authorising the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of money for Secret Service within the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Jackson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Akers-Douglas.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 41.]

TRUST FUNDS (RAILWAYS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Carew, Bill to extend the power of Trustees so as to enable them to invest Trust Funds in home Railways, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Carew, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, and Mr. Cobb.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 42.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 31st August, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Selection, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILL—*First Reading*—Women's Suffrage * (12).

ROLL OF THE LORDS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be *printed.* (No. 10.)

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Order No. 72, be dispensed with in the case of all Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills suspended in the last Session of Parliament.

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION.

The Lords following; viz.,

E. Morley.	L. Boyle.
E. Lathom.	L. Colville of Culross.

were appointed, with the Chairman of Committees, a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the five Lords to form a Select Committee for the consideration of each opposed Private Bill.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for extending the right of voting at Parliamentary Elections to duly qualified women—Was *presented* by The Lord Denman; read 1ª. (No. 12.)

House adjourned at half past Four o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 31st August, 1886.

MINUTES.] — PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL — *Second Reading* — Public Health (Scotland) (Urray Water) * [279].

QUESTIONS.

BELFAST MAIN DRAINAGE BILL.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if any action has been taken in reference to the Belfast Main Drainage Bill, which appears upon the Paper to-day?

MR. SPEAKER: As there was also a Notice of opposition to the Bill on the Paper, it was impossible that any action could be taken in reference to it. I understand that the Notice for the third reading of the Bill to-day has been taken off the Paper in the Private Bill Office.

POST OFFICE—BOOK POST PARCELS.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will consider the possibility of allowing the use of the Continental system of making up book post parcels, which consists in enclosing them in ordinary envelopes, with the flap folded inside, and left unsecured by seal or gum?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that this question was fully considered a few months ago by my immediate Predecessor, Lord Wolverton, who came to the same conclusion as that previously arrived at by Mr. Fawcett on the same subject—namely, that the circumstances of the book post in this country are so different from those in foreign countries that no satisfactory comparison of the several regulations is possible, and that, upon the whole, it would not be expedient to alter the rules of the Post Office in the manner suggested. In France a considerable amount of fraud is found to be due to the particular sort of envelope used; and it would be impossible to carry out the proposed change without a large addition to the staff.

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—KIDNAPPING ON THE NIGER—NATIVE REPRISALS.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the case that in May last a steam launch, the property of a British subject, passing up the Niger for purposes of legitimate trade, was, with its cargo, seized by the M'Blama tribe; and what steps, if any, have been taken by Consul Hewett to recover the said property; whether, in October last, the National African Company kidnapped three boys belonging to the said tribes, and still detain them, though instructed by Consul Hewett on June 2nd to hand them over; whether the seizure of the launch, its crew and cargo, was an act of reprisal on the part of the Natives for the detention of the three boys; that the launch and cargo are still in the hands of the Natives; and that the agent of the Company, when informed of the imprisonment of the crew by the Natives, declined, nevertheless, to interfere in any way for their rescue; what remedy the crew and the owners of the launch, and of the cargo, have for the injuries and loss they have sustained or still sustain, and against whom; and, whether Her Majesty's Government, having regard to the charter lately granted to the National African Company, will inquire into the matter with a view to prevent such acts?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): This matter has engaged the attention of Her Majesty's Government. It is not certain whether the violence offered to this vessel can be traced to the holding as hostages by the National African Company of three of the M'Blama Tribe. The attention of the Company in question was at once, however, called to the incident, and on the 13th of July they telegraphed to their agents that the M'Blama hostages were at once to be returned to their tribe. On the 23rd ultimo they also informed the Foreign Office that every effort was being made by the Company and by the British Consul to obtain the surrender of the vessel and cargo, and the immediate surrender of the marauding Chief who had seized them. Her Majesty's Government can offer no opinion as to who is legally liable for the loss sustained by this outrage. They, however, have every hope that the grant of the Charter just issued to the National African Company will enable better police arrangements to be made, and prevent such occurrences taking place in future.

ADMIRALTY — THE CHANNEL SQUADRON—BUTTERINE.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether any, and, if so, what quantity of butterine or butter substitutes for the use of the ships' companies was on board the ships of the Channel Squadron on their late visit to Cork Harbour; what was the contract price per cwt. of such butter substitutes; and, what proportion did that price bear to the price per cwt. of first and also second quality butter in the Cork market at the time of the Squadron's visit?

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (A LORD of the ADMIRALTY) (Marylebone, E.) (who replied) said: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer the Question. Butter is not an article of ration in the Navy. It is only supplied to saloon messes of troopships. Ships' companies may buy privately butter, or butterine, or anything they like, so long as it is not of an alcoholic nature.

FRANCE—AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CLASSES.

Mr. F. S. POWELL (Wigan) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether a further Report has been published by members of the Commission appointed by the French Chambers of Deputies to inquire into the situation of the agricultural and industrial classes in France; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House extracts from such Report (in continuation of Return [C. 4667])?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E) (who replied) said: Her Majesty's Minister at Paris has replied to an inquiry on the subject that the statement that a further Report has been published is incorrect.

SPAIN—FERNANDO PO—EXPULSION OF THE REV. WILLIAM WELFORD.

Mr. BURT (Morpeth) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any reply has yet been received from the Spanish Government to the claim made several months ago by the Primitive Methodist Missionary Society for compensation on account of the imprisonment of the Rev. William Welford in Fernando Po, and his subsequent expulsion from that island by order of the Governor; whether any assurance has been received from the Government in Madrid that the Primitive Methodists will be allowed the liberty Spanish law permits to pursue their mission work in Fernando Po; and, whether, in case this information has not been received, the Government will instruct Her Majesty's representative at Madrid to press for a settlement of this long pending case?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): The reply of the Spanish Government with regard to this Question was received on the 23rd instant, and will in due course be communicated to the Primitive Methodist Missionary Society. It maintains that the authorities at Fernando Po, in their dealings with Mr. Welford, acted strictly in conformity with Spanish law.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—DUBLIN COMMISSION COURT HOUSE.

Mr. PETER M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If his attention has been called to the condition and unsuitability of the City of Dublin Commission Court House; and, if not, will he cause to be submitted to him the Reports of the judges' observations on that subject to the several grand juries, and especially that of the Recorder at the opening of the City Sessions last July; if he is aware that the Corporation of Dublin have expressed their willingness to contribute their due share of the expense of erecting a suitable Court House, one-third of the whole, provided the Treasury, or the Treasury and County of Dublin, provide the remainder; and, if the present Government purpose taking steps within a reasonable time to find a remedy for this long-standing complaint?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): We have heard nothing on this subject at the Treasury since 1883; but I have referred to the Papers of that year. It appears that at that time the three parties concerned—the city, the county, and the Government—had come to agreement, at least so far as the financial arrangements were concerned, and that action was suspended at the desire of the Dublin Corporation, who said on November 29, 1883, that they did not see their way to proceed with the erection of a new Court House.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPHIC MONEY ORDERS.

Mr. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will consider the system of Telegraphic Money Orders, with a view to its adoption in this Country?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that I have not yet had time to fully consider the suggestion he makes; but I shall give it my best attention during the Recess. There is a question as to providing money to meet the demands at small offices, and there are various difficulties which require very careful examination.

LOCOMOTIVES AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—BYE-LAWS OF ROAD TRUSTEES (FORFARSHIRE).

Mr. MENZIES (Perthshire, E.) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether his attention has been called to the recent prosecution of Messrs. Crichton, Burrelton, Perthshire, for contravention of a by-law regarding locomotives which had been approved by the Home Secretary in 1880, whereby Messrs. Crichton had been fined for using waggons in Forfarshire which it is legal and unobjectionable to use in Perthshire; if he will consider the question whether the power to pass a by-law for merely regulating the use of locomotives on roads includes the power to affect the construction of locomotives and waggons, which is carefully and minutely specified in a separate section of "The Locomotives Amendment Act (Scotland), 1878," as regards locomotives, and in various statutes as regards waggons; and, whether he will in future endeavour to aim at introducing greater uniformity into the by-laws made by road trustees when granting or withholding his approval to such by-laws?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): With reference to the first part of the Question, I understand that the conviction was obtained in Forfarshire on account of a breach of bye-laws affecting locomotives in that county. There are no bye-laws in Perthshire, which accounts for the circumstance that no objection was taken to the action of Messrs. Crichton and Burrelton in that county. With regard to the second part of the Question, the hon. Member asks me to consider a purely legal question affecting the validity of bye-laws approved by the Secretary of State, and which can be questioned in a Court of Law. I do not think any public advantage would be gained by my expressing an abstract opinion on the point. As regards the third part of the Question, I have, as I said the other day, every desire to promote, as far as possible, uniformity between the bye-laws adopted in the various counties.

ADMIRALTY—PAY OF CREWS ON THE CHINA STATION—RATE OF EXCHANGE.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What rule is followed in settling the rate of exchange at which the crews of Her Majesty's ships employed on the China station are paid; if he will state the mean rate of exchange during the years 1884, 1885, 1886, and the corresponding rates at which the payments have been made; and, what rules are followed with regard to rate of exchange in paying money into or out of the Naval Savings Bank?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The rate of exchange at which the dollar is reckoned in calculating the pay of the crews of Her Majesty's ships on the China Station is that fixed at the beginning of each financial year by the Treasury. The following are the mean rates of exchange during the financial years 1884-5, 1885-6, and 1886-7, so far as can be ascertained from bills of exchange drawn upon the Accountant General of the Navy—namely, 1884-5, 3*s.* 9*d.* per dollar; 1885-6, 3*s.* 5½*d.* per dollar; 1886-7, 3*s.* 4½*d.* per dollar; the rates of the dollar as fixed by the Treasury for those three years being as follows:—1884-5, 3*s.* 9*d.* per dollar; 1885-6, 3*s.* 9*d.* per dollar; 1886-7, 3*s.* 7*d.* per dollar. In the case of the deposits of money in the Naval Savings Bank, and withdrawn therefrom, the dollar is, in the same manner, valued at the rate laid down annually by the Treasury.

COMMANDER BETHELL inquired whether he was right in supposing there was no regular rule?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes; the Treasury estimate, according to the average of the preceding year, what should be the rate for the ensuing year; but, owing to the fall in silver, there has been some difficulty in settling the rates of exchange to rule during the present year.

COMMISSIONERS OF NORTHERN LIGHTS—WANT OF LIGHTHOUSES ON THE WEST COAST OF SHETLAND.

MR. LYELL (Orkney and Shetland) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he is aware that the whole of the west coast of Shetland is at present unlighted, and that lighthouses are urgently required there for the better protection of Ocean shipping passing round the north of Scotland, as well as the safety of the local fishing population; and, whether he will communicate with the Northern Lighthouse Commissioners as to the most suitable sites for the lighthouses required, and will take the necessary steps to have those lighthouses erected?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): My attention was first called to the subject by the Question of the hon. Member, and I have communicated with the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and also with the Board of Trade, with whom the matter more properly rests.

PARLIAMENT—PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—HOUSE OF COMMONS ARRANGEMENTS—A SELECT COMMITTEE.

SIR RICHARD PAGET (Somerset, Wells) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in view of the difficulty and inconvenience frequently arising from overcrowding in the House of Commons, the Government would consent to the appointment of a Select Committee, to whom should be referred the Reports, lately reprinted, of the Select Committee of 1867-8 on the House of Commons Arrangements?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): In reply to my hon. Friend, I have to say that I cannot altogether accept to the full extent he would wish, perhaps, the premisses of the Question. But if my hon. Friend should be fortunate enough in gaining an opportunity next Session of bringing this matter before the House, and if it should be the general desire of the House that a Committee of this kind should be appointed, then, of course, the Government would not offer any opposition. But I would not wish my hon. Friend to suppose by this answer that the Government would be in any way committed to any proposal which would entail any large expenditure upon the present Houses of Parliament.

SIR RICHARD PAGET gave Notice that next Session he would move for the appointment of a Select Committee on the subject.

ADMIRALTY (DOCKYARDS)—WORKS AT HAULBOWLINE.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kerry, S.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the new store and engine-house at Haulbowline, for the erection of which money was granted by the last Parliament, has been begun; and, if not, how soon will the commencement of the work be ordered; and, whether it is the intention of the Admiralty to carry out the original design as regards the making of a second graving dock?

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT) (Sheffield, Ecclesall): The plans for the new engine-house are now ready, and the work, for which £1,500 has been provided in this year's Estimate, has been ordered. Space has been left for a second graving dock; but it is not proposed to construct it at present.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—THE EAST PIER OF KINGSTOWN.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If the loose gravel on the East Pier of Kingstown can be removed so as to make it suitable for a promenade?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said, that the pier was in charge of the Board of Works, who informed him that they were not aware that there was any loose gravel on the pier. There was, however, a store of small gravel about 30 yards long and three yards broad, which was absolutely necessary for the purpose of making concrete to repair the sea slope. This did not interfere with the use of the pier as a promenade.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—THE CONSTABULARY (CASUALTIES).

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will inform the House how many members of the Royal Irish Constabulary have, up to the present date, been killed and wounded in the Belfasts riots of this year? The right hon. Member said he would further like to ask, if it was in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to give them the information, if he could tell them the number of the military who had been killed and wounded in the Belfast riots of the present season?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am afraid I can give no information as to the military. That was not included in the Question. I am informed that one head-constable was killed, and 5 officers and 36 members of the Constabulary were seriously injured. In all, 332 members of the force of all ranks were more or less injured; but in many cases the injuries were not serious.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast W., and Sligo, S.): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the number he has given includes all the men who were incapacitated; and whether he can distinguish between the injuries so as to show what was the number of wounds inflicted by firearms?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I believe those figures include all the men who were incapacitated. I am not able to distinguish between the injuries inflicted by firearms; but the large majority of the injuries has been caused by stone-throwing.

NAVY (CONTRACTS)—SUPPLIES OF MESS PORK.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kerry, S.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is the intention to give contracts this year for supplies of mess pork for the Navy to firms outside the three kingdoms; and, whether they will advertise for tender in the principal newspapers in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and apply for tenders to the large bacon-curers of the three countries?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): Until the tenders are received, it is not possible to say to whom the contracts for mess pork will be given for this year; but preference will be given to firms within the Three Kingdoms, should the tenders be at all equal. Advertisements will be inserted in the newspapers in circulation where the industry of pork curing is practised; and forms of tender will be sent to packers known to the Admiralty, as well as to any others who apply. Bacon is not used in Her Majesty's Navy.

DISPENSARIES (IRELAND)—ELY DISPENSARY, CO. FERMANAGH.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) (for Mr. William Redmond) (Fermanagh, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it with the knowledge and approbation of the Local Government Board that the Ely Dispensary in Derrygonally, county Fermanagh, is used by the Orangemen of the district as an Orange Hall, and that an Orange Lodge meets, and the instruments of an Orange band are stored there; is it a fact that Orange flags float from the windows of this dispensary; did a party of Orangemen take possession of this dispensary on the night of the 14th July last, and from the windows shout insulting language at the Catholic and Nationalist people; did these same Orangemen smash the windows of this dispensary on the night of the 14th July last, and, if so, who repaired the damage done to the windows; are Roman Catholic ratepayers asked to support by their rates the said dispensary; and, what course the Government intend to take in the matter?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that the landlord of the building let a part of it to the Dispensary Committee, and another part to an Orange Lodge. This arrangement has existed for several years, and neither the Local Government Board nor the Lord Lieutenant has any power to interfere in the matter. Orange flags did not float, as I am informed, from the windows of the building, nor did a party of Orangemen take possession of it on the night of the 14th of July. There was a party of Orangemen in that part of the building which was used as their Lodge, and crowds passing shouted at them, and were replied to by rival shouts on the part of the Orangemen. Some windows of the Orange Lodge were broken, but not the windows of the dispensary.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — EVICTIONS IN WOODFORD, CO. GALWAY — COUNTY INSPECTOR O'BRIEN.

Mr. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether County Inspector O'Brien, who commands the Police Forces at the evictions in Woodford, has threatened the shopkeepers of Portumna to quarter the Military on them; whether he has any authority or power to do so; and, whether General Buller has got authority to do so in any similar case that may arise?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The forces on duty at Woodford having been extensively "Boycotted," the County Inspector thought it right to warn some of the licensed traders as to the risk of having their licences opposed which they ran in refusing to supply the police, and also as to the state of the law with regard to billeting. The County Inspector does not seem to me to have exceeded his duty, or acted otherwise than in a considerate manner, in giving this warning. Of course, General Buller, if necessary, could do the same.

COUNTY VOTERS ACT (SCOTLAND)—ASSESSORS.

Mr. MORE (Shropshire, Ludlow) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that the registration of voters is entrusted by the County Voters Act in Scotland to a public official called an assessor, who also superintends the yearly valuation of property, and who may be also an Inland Revenue officer; how the number of such assessors is determined; what is their usual salary, and how that salary is paid; and, if he would make inquiries as to whether this plan is considered satisfactory in Scotland; and, if so, if he would further consider whether the introduction of such an official would not be conducive to making the register of Parliamentary voters in England a more complete register of all persons duly qualified to vote than it is under the present system?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said, he was very much obliged to the hon. Member for having sent him a Schedule which furnished him with materials for answering this Question; but as the Question dealt with a subject of Scottish law, in the intricacies of which he was afraid he was not competent to enter, he must refer him to his right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate, who, he believed, was prepared to answer that portion of the Question. With reference to the last portion of the Question, if it should be his duty to deal with the question of the Registration Laws in England, he certainly should not fail to avail himself of all the information at his disposal.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities) said, the Assessor in Scotland made out the Valuation Roll, and it was also his duty to prepare a List of Voters, with the view to its revisal in the proper Court. His primary duty was to make up the Valuation Roll; but the separate duty was put upon him by statute. The Assessors were generally one for each county, and one for each of the principal burghs. Only one county in Scotland had two Assessors—namely, the county of Lanark—where the great size and population of the county made this necessary. A salary was paid for the work of making up the Valuation Roll. The amount of the salary was determined by the magistrates in the burghs, and by the Commissioners of Supply in the counties. It was quite usual to appoint an officer of the Inland Revenue to act as Assessor; and he believed that that arrangement had proved so satisfactory that the tendency was all in the direction—in the counties certainly—of appointing an Inland Revenue officer to act. When an Inland Revenue officer was appointed, he received no salary for the work of making up the Valuation Roll; but he was paid for the work of making up the List of Voters in preparation for the Registration Courts.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—MR. C. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE.

Mr. PETER M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Treasury Remembrancer on the Accounts of Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland; whether the said late Official Assignee is being allowed per centages on sums found by the Treasury Remembrancer to be due by him in liquidation of his liability to the Court; and, if sums standing at the credit of estates of which Mr. C. H. James had charge, but not capable of being divided among the creditors of such estates, are transferred in globo to the credit of the Unclaimed Dividend Account, as provided by the statute; and, if not, how are the same applied or disposed of?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): I have to thank the hon. Member for having postponed this Question at my request, and to express my regret that I am still unable to reply to the first part of it. The Report was addressed to the Bankruptcy Judges, and is not within the control of the Irish Government. I hope, however, to receive the original Report, or a copy of it, within this week, and on doing so I shall at once communicate with the hon. Member. As to the rest of his Question, I am informed that the late Official Assignee is not allowed percentages on sums found to be due by him. The only sums transferred to the credit of the Unclaimed Dividend Account are either unclaimed dividends, or, where there is a balance to the credit of an estate so small as not to bear the expenses of division, among the creditors.

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)—LOANS TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the present system of making loans to Irish fishermen renders it practically impossible for most of the members of that class who require loans to obtain them; and, if so, whether the relaxation in the rules relating to this matter, which was made by the Lord Lieutenant in December last in the case of fishermen on the west and north-west coasts of Ireland, will be extended to the cases of the rest of that body for the purpose of enabling such of them as are without proper gear and boats to procure those indispensable requisites to the profitable pursuit of the fishing industry? The hon. Member added that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would also be able to answer a further Question of which he had given him private Notice. It was—Whether the relationship referred to in the Question on the Paper was not made by order of the Lords Justices in Council in January last without restriction of particular localities; and, if so, why it has been restricted to the west and north-west coasts of Ireland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I regret I have not been able to obtain the views of the Fishery Inspectors, as they are absent on their duties. If the hon. Member will be good enough to repeat the Question next week, of which he has given me private Notice, I will endeavour to give him an answer.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—TELEGRAPHIC DEPARTMENT—MISS B. DUFFY.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Postmaster General, If Miss B. Duffy, now employed as a telegraphist at Patrick's Well, who was promised a transfer in 1883 to Dublin, will soon be promoted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): Sir, I have to thank the hon. Member for his courteous postponement of the Question. I now have to say that the Miss Duffy to whom he refers is not on the establishment of the Post Office. She was allowed some time ago to become an applicant for a transfer; but there was no promise of a permanent establishment appointment in Dublin made to her. In 1882 the late Postmaster General, in reply to an application on her behalf, said that he would put her name down on the list, but informed her at the time that there were many other applicants who had prior claims. I may, perhaps, be allowed to appeal to hon. and gallant Gentlemen who have the interest of their fair constituents and country-women at heart not to press their claims by Questions in this House, because if the qualifications of those applicants are to be discussed here, the answering of the Questions will be almost as embarrassing as the Judgment of Paris.

INDIA—THE FOREST SERVICE—PENSIONS.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether Her Majesty's Government will obtain the opinion of the Government of India regarding the concession of more favourable rates of pension, than heretofore, to the members of the Forest Service appointed by the Secretary of State for India?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): The pensions of the Forst Service were brought by the Government of India under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council in July, 1885. It was then decided that there were no sufficient reasons for altering the rates of pension, and the Secretary of State sees no reason for reconsidering this decision.

BULGARIA—ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

Mr. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's Co., Ossory) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government have received any information, confirmatory or otherwise, of the truth of the statements contained in *The Daily News* of the thirtieth instant, as to the alleged treatment of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria by Russian and other Officers; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to make any diplomatic representations in the matter?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government have no official information on the subject of the treatment of Prince Alexander after his seizure and removal from Sofia.

POST OFFICE (SCOTLAND)—POSTAL COMMUNICATION TO THE OUTER HEBRIDES.

MR. CRAIG-SELLAR (Lanarkshire, Partick) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether the Government intend to assist, by subsidy or otherwise, a line of steamboats to the Outer Hebrides, with the view of extending Postal communication in those districts, and of affording facilities to the crofter and fishing population for sending their fish and other produce to the Southern markets?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): The subject referred to by the hon. Member has during the past year received no little attention from successive Secretaries for Scotland and the Public Departments concerned. A steam mail packet service between Oban, Tiree, and Lochboisdale was subsidized by the Government in March, 1886. The Post Office has within the last few weeks issued tenders for further steam packet services between Portree, Tarbert (Harris) and Lochmaddy, and between Lochboisdale and Lochmaddy. In this way the postal circle will be completed.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE LOWER BANN.

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the removal of the Navigation Works on the Lower Bann, between Coleraine and Lough Neagh, which obstruct the free flow of the river and cause the annual flooding of 30,000 acres, are included in the Government scheme?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): In considering the drainage of the Bann the Commission must, I think, also consider the effect on the drainage of the navigation works referred to.

CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION—THE ANGLO-CHINESE CONVENTION, PEKIN.

MR. KING (Hull, Central) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Convention lately signed at Pekin, virtually nullifying the Clause in the Chefoo Convention under which costly preparations had been made to send a mission to Thibet, and further agreeing to send decennial missions from Burma to Pekin, has yet been ratified; what practical advantages have been gained to compensate for these concessions; whether the consequence of the agreement to send a decennial mission from Burma to Pekin is a recognition of the suzerainty of China over the whole of Burma, or to what extent, and what will be its effect upon the status of Chinese subjects visiting Burma or domiciled there; what expense has been incurred in the preparations for the Thibet mission, and whether the cost will be charged on the Indian revenues; whether the Indian Government was consulted before these two concessions were made to China; and, if so, whether that Government approved or objected to them; and, when Papers on the subject will be presented to Parliament?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Convention has not actually been ratified, because it has not yet reached this country in its formal shape; but it is virtually concluded. As practical advantages, we have obtained the fullest recognition by the Chinese Government of the establishment of British rule in Upper Burmah; we have retained freedom of action with reference to our boundaries; we have secured the frontier trade between China and Burmah, and opened up South-West China to our commerce; China has undertaken to promote and stimulate trade between India and Thibet, which was the sole object of our intended Mission to the latter. The agreement does not recognize the suzerainty of China over any part of Burmah, and in no way affects the *status* of Chinese subjects in Burmah. The cost of the preparations for the Thibet Mission is not yet known; it will be borne by Indian Revenues. The negotiations were conducted throughout in communication with the Government of India, and the terms of the Convention had their entire approval before they were approved by Her Majesty's Government. A copy of the agreement will be presented to Parliament as soon as it has been received from Pekin.

SPAIN—THE COMMERCIAL TARIFF—"CERTIFICATES OF ORIGIN."

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT (Manchester, S.W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware that the new tariff arrangements with Spain cause a "certificate of origin" to be necessary, and that the Spanish authorities at the ports of entry require a declaration that the goods are not only of British manufacture, but that they are of the manufacture of the party whose name appears on the declaration, a statement which clearly cannot be made by the merchant; and, whether he can give any assurance that this serious hindrance to trade will be removed?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): The attention of the Secretary of State was at once called to the inconvenience caused by the requirements of the Spanish Customs Authorities in this respect. He made representations accordingly, which have been received by the Spanish Government with the utmost consideration, and a public announcement will be made immediately of the amended regulations. These are briefly that the shipper of goods will testify to their British origin, and the certificate of the Spanish Consul will be given without fee.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—"THE QUEEN *v.* PHAIR."

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether Mr. Justice Murphy has been communicated with in reference to his remarks in the case of the Queen v. Phair, on the action of Captain M'Ternan, R.M., and Messrs. French, Creighton, Winslow, Johnston, and Westropp, J.P's, in entering no rule in a case of a party nature in which two Orangemen were charged with assaulting a Catholic, and on what information the Government have come to the conclusion that the conduct of those gentlemen, which his Lordship described as "monstrous," and on which he "commented severely," was only "an error of judgment;" who the Resident Magistrate is on whose report the Government are acting; and, whether the Government intend to address any communication to the magistrates rebuked by Judge Murphy pointing out their duty in cases in which a conflict of evidence arises?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): Mr. Justice Murphy was not communicated with on the subject referred to; and the terms of my former answer clearly show that I was stating to the House my own inference drawn from the language quoted by the hon. Member himself. The Resident Magistrate, Captain M'Ternan, had reported that the language was quoted with substantial correctness; but he did not suggest any interpretation of it. It is not intended to address any communication to the magistrates, who have already had their duty in dealing with cases where there is conflicting evidence explained to them by the learned Judge.

Mr. HEALY: May I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether it is a fact that the Government in this matter are basing their judgment on the report of a gentleman incriminated?

Mr. HOLMES: No, Sir; certainly not.

ARMY—THE CAVALRY REGIMENT AT DUNDALK.

Mr. J. NOLAN (Galway, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, If the Cavalry regiment at present stationed in Dundalk is to be removed in the near future; if so, by what regiment is it to be replaced, and at about what date is it proposed to make the contemplated change?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster) said, he had only received Notice of the Question that morning, and he had not had time to get the necessary information.

MERTOPOLIS — DWELLINGS OF THE WORKING CLASSES—DEMOLITIONS AT CHELSEA.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the contemplated scheme for pulling down houses in Chelsea, now inhabited by about ten thousand of the working classes, in order to erect upon their site blocks of palatial residences; and, whether he will take steps whereby provisions similar to those contained in the Standing Orders of both Houses of Parliament, which impose upon Railway Companies severe regulations as to the pulling down of dwellings of the working classes, can be made applicable with regard to similar demolitions by private landowners, in time to prevent the eviction of thousands from Chelsea of the artizans and others from their homes, without any prospect of their finding others in the neighbourhood in which they have long resided?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): Sir, my attention has been called to schemes contemplated by Lord Cadogan for the improvement of part of his Chelsea estate. According to the best information I can obtain, the largest scheme will affect the present residences of about 1,400 people, and Lord Cadogan has insisted on industrial dwellings being provided sufficient to accommodate 800 persons. None of the new residences, the building of which is contemplated, can, by the utmost stretch of exaggerated language, be described as "palatial." The execution of the schemes cannot be begun till Michaelmas, 1887, when the present lease expires. The Chelsea Vestry have sanctioned the intended improvements. Standing Orders imposing certain conditions on Railway Companies who seek to acquire compulsorily the houses of others do not appear applicable to the case of a private owner dealing with his own property. But I would point out that, in the present case, Lord Cadogan proposes voluntarily to do more than any Standing Order would require.

ADMIRALTY—GUN PRACTICE AT SOUTHSEA—RECOVERY OF SHOT.

SIR SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will issue instructions that inquiries be made whether the gun practice at the batteries of Southsea may be so arranged, by firing only at targets in a line with ground having a firm bottom, that the shot may be recovered, thus giving profitable employment to thirty or forty fishermen, at a time when fishing is out of season, and also effecting thereby a saving of a considerable sum to the Country; and, if this be found to be the case, will the Government give the necessary instructions to have this alteration carried out?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The suggestion seems a very reasonable one; and I have given directions that inquiry should be made of the Commander-in-Chief at Portsmouth if any such arrangement could be made.

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—THE INCHIGEELAGH DISPENSARY DISTRICT—MEDICAL RELIEF.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether a medical inspector had lately been sent by the Local Government Board to visit the Inchigeelagh district; whether he had condemned the existing arrangements which compelled the poor people to travel extravagant distances in order to obtain medical relief; whether any report had been given dealing with the case in question; whether Dr. Barrett will be compelled to attend at least one day in the week at Ballingeary; whether the medical inspector gave any suggestion how the dispensary stations should be fixed; if any such suggestions were put back to the Managing Committee, through the Macroom Board of Guardians for approval; and, whether the Committee had adopted or rejected any such proposals?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board has recently visited the district named, and recommended an alteration in the existing arrangements with the object of affording the persons residing in the western portion of the district greater facilities for obtaining medical relief. The suggested arrangements include the establishment of an auxiliary dispensary, and the erection of a residence for a medical officer mid-way between the local and the head dispensary. The dispensary committee, to whom the matter was referred by the Board of Guardians, objected to the proposal as involving unnecessary expenditure, and they have been called upon to hold a special meeting for further consideration of the matter.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—THE CORK MAGISTRATES.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware of the difficulty in the city of Cork of obtaining the attendance at the Police Office of the unpaid magistrates; if he could state on how many days in the past two years the Court was obliged to be adjourned or was detained in consequence of their non-attendance, thereby occasioning loss and inconvenience to the professional gentlemen, officials, and witnesses who were obliged to attend; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a list of the unpaid magistracy of the city of Cork, together with the list of the days appointed for their several attendance at the Police Office, Cork, setting forth therein the number of attendances of the respective magistrates for the years 1885 and 1886?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Clerk of Petty Sessions reports that the Cork Police Court was never, during the last two years, adjourned for the want of attendance of magistrates, but that there have been occasions when the business was delayed by the unpunctuality of magistrates; and there have been also some occasions when a particular case had to be put off in consequence of the requisite number of magistrates not being present to dispose of it. I do not think that any useful object would be gained by the presentation of such a Return as is suggested, but I will look further into the matter as soon as possible; and I must say generally that I think it is a question deserving grave consideration whether magistrates who do not do any work ought to be retained in the Commission of the Peace.

ADMIRALTY—REPORT ON THE "COLLINGWOOD" GUN.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the Report of the Committee on the *Collingwood* gun has yet been made, the late First Lord of the Admiralty having stated, on the 31st of May, that he had been told by the War Office that the said Report would be furnished "in a fortnight or three weeks;" and, whether he is able to give the name of the official who supplied this erroneous information to his predecessor?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster) (who replied) said: I will answer this Question. The Surveyor General of the Ordnance stated on the 23rd instant, in reply to a Question of the hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth (Sir Henry Tyler), that the Report had just been received, and would be laid before Parliament as soon as possible. On reference to *Hansard* I find that what the First Lord of the Admiralty said was that "it was anticipated that the Report would be forthcoming in a fortnight or three weeks." The Report has been laid on the Table of the House.

ARMY (INDIA)—EUROPEAN CAVALRY REGIMENTS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, When it is intended to carry out the augmentation of an additional squadron to every European Regiment of Cavalry on the Indian Establishment, as notified in the autumn of last year?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): It is intended to carry out the arrangement referred to in the Question during the present trooping season.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE 59—BATOUM.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in view of the recent declaration of the Czar of Russia, which attempts to abrogate the 59th Article of the Treaty of Berlin, under which Batoum was declared to be a "free and commercial port," What steps Her Majesty's Government propose to take to obtain the judgment of the Signatory Powers to the Treaty of Berlin upon this violation of that Treaty, and of the solemn contract between the Czar of Russia and the other Powers, and to prevent a condition menacing the liberty of the Black Sea?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): I have already stated, in reply to a Question from the hon. Member for South Worcestershire, that Her Majesty's Government do not intend to carry this case beyond the position taken in Lord Rosebery's despatch of July 3rd.

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT) —SIR REDVERS BULLER—STABLING FOR HORSES.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is correct, as it appears in *The Times* newspaper this morning, that General Sir Redvers Buller has stabled his horses in the establishment of Lord Kenmare; whether he is aware that Lord Kenmare is at present engaged in wholesale evictions; and whether it is the intention of General Buller to undertake eviction duty?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I cannot say for certain where General Buller has stabled his horses. No doubt, he has done so wherever he found proper accommodation. As to Lord Kenmare's proceedings, I know nothing whatever.

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether in case the debate on the Address should be in progress at 12 o'clock to-night the Government would move the adjournment of the debate, in order to allow the House to proceed with the consideration of the Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill? He might add that it was not necessary for him to ask the noble Lord a Question, of which he had given him private Notice.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to remind him that when the Government gave Notice of their intention to introduce this Bill, they stated that it would not be in their power to press the Bill if it was met with anything like a sustained opposition. With regard to the Question which he has now immediately put to me, I have to say that the Government will certainly not interrupt the proceedings on the Address in order to bring on this Bill. They consider the proceedings on the Address are of the first importance, and that there is nothing whatever in the contents of the Bill of a nature to warrant hon. Members to place Notice of opposition against it, which would prevent it coming on after half-past 12 o'clock at night.

BULGARIA—RETURN OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any further telegrams had been received at the Foreign Office from Bulgaria with reference to the progress of Prince Alexander towards Sofia?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The last information we had was that the Prince was going first to Philippopolis, before going to Sofia.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (MOTION FOR THE ADDRESS).

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [NINTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August] —[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed*.

CROFTERS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1886— INADEQUACY OF THE ACT.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.), in rising to move as an Amendment—

> "And this House humbly expresses its regret that the condition of affairs in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is very unsatisfactory; that the administration of the Law does not possess the confidence of the people; that the Naval Forces are supposed to be re-

quired to overawe a portion of the population; and that the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the formation of new holdings, where they are urgently required,"

said, he appeared in the capacity of the Mover of the Amendment rather by accident than by intention. He understood that in consequence of the course taken last night on the adjournment of the House by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark)—the champion of the crofters—he had exhausted his right, and was technically precluded from moving his Motion. He (Mr. Esslemont) accepted in the fullest manner the disclaimer made by the Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill) last night, and did not assume that the adjournment of the House implied the slightest disrespect to Scotland. He might be allowed to say, in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour), that the Amendment before the House did not imply on the part of the Mover the slightest reflection upon the action of the present Government. It was not on them primarily that any blame lay in regard to the inadequacy of the measure passed on behalf of the crofters and cottars in the Highlands of Scotland. It was only just to say on behalf of the Leaders of the Opposition, however, that in circumscribing the Crofters Act of the last Parliament—which, he thought, was circumscribed to its very lowest limits—they were very considerably helped by those who were then in Opposition and now occupied the Treasury Bench. Their reason, therefore, for calling attention to this subject was to suggest to the Members of the present Government, and to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland in particular, that there was a great and good opportunity of doing more ample justice to the Highlands and Islands, to the crofters and cottars, than was done by the Government which preceded them; and he hoped they would take advantage of that opportunity at the earliest possible moment to amend what hon. Members representing the crofters considered and pointed out at the time to be deficient in the Crofters Bill. He was somewhat damped by the answer he got yesterday from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland in regard to any intention on his part to espouse a certain class of the cottars and crofters who were labouring under disadvantages over which practically they had no control, and who were still left out in the cold with regard to remedial measures that had been applied to their class elsewhere. He, however, did not intend to enter into that question, believing that it would be beyond the terms of the Amendment; but he hoped on an early day to have an apportunity of calling attention to it, because he believed it was a question which could not be allowed to sleep, but which must be taken up either by the Government or by the people of Scotland themselves. His apology for introducing the question at all on behalf of his hon. Friend the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) was that the county which he represented contained more crofters and cottars than any other county in Scotland. Those crofters and cottars, while deserving well, and in some sense better, of the Government, had been entirely left out in the cold. If those of them who were represented by himself (Mr. Esslemont) and the hon. Member for the Western Division of Aberdeen (Dr. Farquharson) had been lawless, and had made great disturbances and had broken the law, if an Army and Navy had been sent to quiet them, they would have been, he believed, better off than they were now, and enjoying the benefits of the Crofters and Cottars Act. They, therefore, thought it rather hard that, having been law-abiding, and having waited patiently for the interposition of Her Majesty's Government to deliver the cottars and crofters from the great distress under which they laboured, and the unfair conditions on which they held their cottages and crofts, they should be excluded from the benefits of an Act at least intended to be beneficial to their class. He would remind the Government, and especially the Scottish Secretary, that in Aberdeenshire they had a fisher class which had seemed to receive the greatest consideration from the then Opposition at the time the Crofters and Cottars Act was passed, and that that Opposition evinced a desire to give encouragement to those fishers who were also cottars by helping them in a financial and substantial way in regard to their wants—such as harbours, and the conditions of their tenure. The conditions of tenure under which they existed, it was well known, were very discouraging to their interests and disadvantageous from a financial point of view. He moved the Amendment for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government to this subject, and he was not without hope that the present Secretary for Scotland would give the matter the attention and consideration which it deserved. All they wanted was that the matter should receive inquiry and an impartial consideration, because they were satisfied that the justice of their case would commend itself to any Government, whether Conservative, Liberal, or Radical. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment which stood in his name.

MR. McLAREN (Cheshire, Crewe), on rising to second the Amendment, said, that although an English Member he was a Scotchman, and had a hereditary interest in Scotch matters, as those hon Members would easily understand who remembered the long services of his late father as Member for the City of Edinburgh; and he had another reason for being interested in the condition of the Highlands — namely, that a very large majority of the Liberal Party in the capital of the Highlands looked to him to represent them on that occasion. It was his fortune at the Election of 1885 to contest the Inverness Burghs against the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Finlay) who at present sat for that constituency, and he was beaten by a small majority. On that occasion he (Mr. McLaren) received the great bulk of the Liberal vote. The hon. and learned Gentleman received the Conservative vote, and sat in that House in virtue of that vote. As a natural consequence, the hon. and learned Gentleman not infrequently voted with the Conservative Party, and was one of the leading Unionist Members on the Liberal side of the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman was a man of great ambition, and soared high in his political views, having endeavoured to reconstruct the Established Church in a way no Liberal wished it to be reconstructed. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Question!"] He begged pardon; but, of course, he had said this to show why on that occasion he (Mr. McLaren) represented a section of the electors of Inverness. It had often been charged against the Crofter and Irish Members that they stirred up ill-feeling in their constituencies for Party purposes, and that the grievances of the crofters were not really genuine grievances. The charge could not be made against him, because he was in no way dependent upon the crofter vote; but it was because he felt sincerely and strongly on this question, and knowing the grievances of the crofters, that he desired to impress those grievances upon the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) and the House. For his part, looking to the administration of Scotch law, he considered that whatever a Radical or Liberal Government might be in regard to English or Irish affairs, when it came to deal with Scotch matters it was neither Liberal nor Radical, but Whig. Therefore, Scotland need not be much troubled at the fact that she had exchanged a Whig Government for a Conservative Government. He himself would greatly prefer to have Scotch matters administered in a generous spirit by a liberal-minded Scotch Secretary who was a Conservative, than by a Whig who was under the influence of the traditions of the Edinburgh Parliament House. The Conservative Party had now a very great chance of settling Scotch affairs, and all they asked them to do was to inquire into the justice of the grievances, and treat them in a generous spirit. No one who had any acquaintance with the Highlands could say that the condition of that part of the country was satisfactory; and the description given by the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) of the condition of the people of Gweedore would apply with equal truth to many places in Scotland. They all knew of the evictions in Highland parishes in the past. About 18 months ago, when in Sutherlandshire, he met crofters who told him that within their own recollection, and in the recollection of their fathers, while they had been living in their houses the agents of the Duke of Sutherland had come and taken burning peats from the fires in the cottages and set fire to the thatch roof when the inmates were sick in bed. [An hon. MEMBER: Shame!] The Sutherlandshire crofters had, to a certain extent, their revenge, because so far as their representation was concerned they had evicted the son of their Duke, and had elected the son of a crofter to represent them, and probably for the first time in their history they would be adequately represented in that House. Evictions were not only an old story; they had been going on till the Act of last Session. The Report of the Crofters Commission bore witness that there were three landlords who evicted their tenants for giving evidence before that Commission; and that there were other landlords who would not promise security to their tenants if they gave evidence. Although the Crofters Act was now passed, there were landlords in Scotland who were endeavouring to prevent the Act from coming into operation. There was a well-known landlord, Lord Lovat, who was endeavouring to persuade all his tenants to take leases, because leaseholders would not get the free benefit of the Crofters Act. He believed that some of Lord Lovat's tenants were resisting. That was only a fair sample of the determined way in which some landlords were endeavouring to frustrate the intentions of the House in passing that Act. It might be said that the Act having been so recently passed they ought to wait until it had been fairly tested. He admitted the great force of that argument, and he did not press the Government to amend the Act in any of its useful provisions; but there were many points in the Act in which it did not go far enough, and there were grievances which it did not profess to touch. The grievances of the crofters might be classed under five heads—the land, fisheries, justice, education, and deer forests and game. With regard to land, the Act of last Session gave security of tenure to crofters under certain conditions. Some of them were reasonable enough; but one was that the crofters were to be bound by the estate regulations, and if hon. Members knew the iniquity of some of these estate laws in the Highlands they would have hesitated before they did anything in that Act that would sanction even a nominal acknowledgment of them at the hands of the House. There were estate regulations which provided that a tenant should not only refrain from poaching himself, but be liable to a heavy fine if he did not prevent others from poaching, or give them up to justice for so doing. There were also regulations which enabled landlords or agents to enter the houses of crofters at any hour of the day or night to search for arms. Irish Members had made a great stir about the Irish Arms Act; but he wondered what they would say about such regulations as these. There were likewise estate laws to provide against overcrowding, and under these no tenant could have in his house more than one son of the age of 21; all the others had to leave, and likewise every daughter who married had to leave her father's house. These were restrictions that would not be tolerated in England, Ireland, or in any part of Scotland except the Highlands. They were tolerated there because Highland lairds were little kings—little despots who were beyond the reach of the ordinary law. The Crofters Act of last Session was inadequate and defective in many respects, and was hedged round by so many conditions and restrictions as to make its benefits almost nugatory; and the power of the crofters to secure the enlargement of their holdings under the Act was so small that there could be very little amelioration of their condition. The clause with reference to deer forests should not have been put in the Act at all, and it should have been perfectly competent for the Land Commission to take fertile land away from deer forests and give it to any tenant in the Highlands who was able to stock it. One provision of the Crofters Act was that no land should be taken for deer forests if it would injuriously affect the inhabitants of the district generally. Who were the inhabitants of the district generally? One great stretch of country from sea to sea was held by a man whose name was execrated all over the Highlands — an American named Winans—and was one great deer forest. He thought that the landlords who let the land for deer forests were to blame more than those who used the land for that purpose. The Act was not adequate to satisfy the Highlanders. Let them consider what injury the deer forests did. The deer forests were not fenced except to a small extent. Instead of its being the business of the landlord to keep the deer in his own forest, it was the business of the crofter to keep them out of his holding. During the harvest months he had been told of crofters being obliged to sit up all night to guard their crops for fear the deer should come down upon them. If the landlords would have deer for their own pleasure and profit they should be bound to fence their property. It should not be necessary for the crofters to sit up all night and guard their crops. The last Government was a Whig Government as far as Scotland was concerned. The right hon. Gentleman the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) had opposed everything proposed by the Crofter Members that was worth having; indeed, if the right hon. Gentleman had been a Tory he could not have offered a more dogged resistance to every Amendment that would have made the Act of any use for the crofter's benefit; and gallantly as the Scotch Members fought him they were unable to make the impression they desired upon the Bill. But they could not expect to gather grapes of thorns, and he was afraid they must wait until a Radical Administration came into power before they could expect the grievances of the crofters to be thoroughly redressed; but, in the meantime, there were some things which the Conservatives could do —some things which did not tread upon Conservative corns—and they would reap the gratitude of the Highlanders, who were prepared to welcome justice with open arms and with gratitude from whoever it came, whether from a Conservative or a Liberal Government. They could see, at any rate, that justice was was done in the Highlands. He did did not mean by doing justice that they were to initiate absurd naval demonstrations. The last naval demonstration was undertaken by the Liberals, and, therefore, the present Secretary for Scotland was not responsible for that; but there was no need for it. There had been no violent deforcement of Sheriff officers; there had been no serious resistance to the law; and he believed the summonses could easily have been served. At all events, there was no resistance; and when the naval demonstration arrived at Tiree the soldiers and sailors were welcomed with open arms. The Highlanders readily extended their hospitality to the invaders, and whisky was served to them all round. What they wanted the Government to do was to see that the officials of justice did their duty; and in this connection he thought they had ground for complaint. As had been shown by a Return moved for by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), there were a great many Procurators Fiscal who were also solicitors and land agents, and he submitted that this was an exceedingly improper state of things. He did not know that the Irish Members could produce any anomaly equal to that of the Procurators Fiscal in Scotland, who acted as Public Prosecutors, and at the same time as solicitors and factors for landlords. There were 54 Procurators, and of these only eight gave their whole time to their duties, and none of these were in the Highlands. There were 22 who also acted as solicitors in their official districts, and of these 11 were in the Highlands. The remaining 24 acted both as solicitors and factors in their official districts, and of these eight were in the Highlands. It was wrong that the Public Prosecutor should be solicitor and factor for the very landlord for or against whom he might have to act in his public capacity. This grievance told with special force upon the crofters who at the present time had strained relations with their landlords. The Crofters Commission dealt fully with this grievance, and he trusted that the Government would take it into consideration. Even if it should require some additional expense, he hoped they would see the absolute necessity of having justice fairly administered in the Highlands. Another grievance that the Government might take up and remedy without trespassing on Conservative prejudices was that of the fishermen. Clause 32 of the Act of last year provided that the Government might advance to the Fishery Board sums of money to be lent to fishermen for the building of boats and the repair of gear, &c.; and he would like to ask the Secretary for Scotland how much money it was proposed to ask Parliament to vote for that purpose? Unfortunately, the clause only applied to the fishermen in Argyll, Caithness, Ross and Cromarty, Inverness-shire, Sutherland, and Orkney and Shetland, and he hoped that the Government would apply this clause of the Act to the fishermen throughout Scotland. The Act should be further extended in the direction of the building of piers and harbours, in order to make it really adequate; and upon this point he was glad that his right hon. Friend the Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks) had given Notice that he would move that a proportionate amount of money be expended for this purpose in Great Britain as was spent in Ireland. When his right hon. Friend made that Motion he would get the support of all who were interested in the crofters; but he hoped the Government would forestall him and rob him of the credit of it by adopting it for themselves. The Royal Commission of two years ago recommended that no less than 10 harbours should be made in the North of Scotland; and the Commissioners pointed out that no less than 300 lives had been lost off the Island of Lewis in 35 years on account of the want of harbour accommodation. Harbours were wanted in Skye and Tiree, and these places were specially mentioned in the Report of the Commissioners. In his opinion it would be to much better purpose to spend money in this way in Syke and Tiree, where it would do great good, rather than waste it upon military and naval demonstrations. Another point was the question of improved communication; and from the answer given by the Secretary for Scotland, he understood the Government had this matter under consideration. In consequence of this want of communication with the mainland the fishermen were frequently unable to get an extra large catch of fish salted for want of salt that otherwise might be telegraphed for; and in consequence of not being acquainted with the market prices of fish they frequently had to sell their fish at a much less price than they ought to obtain for it; therefore, if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland would devote some of his energies to obtaining better telegraph and steam communication with the mainland he would considerably improve the position of the fishermen. Another grievance requiring attention had reference to the cran measure for fish. Fish were principally sold by the cran and quarter-cran; but as there was no regular standard the quarter-cran baskets were constantly becoming larger, the result being that fishermen were really selling for a cran a cran and a-half or a cran and a third. All that was required would be for the Secretary for Scotland to introduce a Bill of one clause, fixing the standard size of the cran.

Mr. SPEAKER, calling the hon. Gentleman to Order, said, that his remarks were not pertinent to the Amendment. The Amendment referred to the alleged failure of the Crofters Act to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the mode of selling fish did not seem pertinent to the Amendment.

Mr. McLAREN said, he apologized for trespassing outside the bounds of the Amendment, and remarked that he had said all that he wished to say upon this point. He presumed it would be irregular to call attention to the question of education in the Highlands, which also formed a serious grievance. Upon the question generally he hoped that the Government would deal generously with Scotland in this matter. It was of great importance to the country that the crofting populations of the Highlands should be kept up, who furnished recruits so largely both to the Army and to the Navy. The crofting populations numbered some 40,000 families, and they were an important body for the defences of the country, no less than 4,400 of them belonging to the Naval Reserve of the country. For this reason they should be encouraged by the Government, and their eviction should be stopped. He would also urge that the Act should be altered so as to give further facilities for the enlargement of their holdings, as that would have the effect of stopping emigration, and even to bring back many of the crofters who had settled in other parts of the world. The crofters were not able to enforce their demands as the Irish had done; but he hoped that would be no reason for the Government turning a cold shoulder to their wishes. He hoped the House would recognize that the crofters had grievances which could be redressed without doing damage to any other legitimate interest. The Secretary for Scotland had great powers for the redress of the grievances of these people; and, as an English Member and a Scotchman, he (Mr. McLaren) would urge him to go as far as he considered it to be necessary, and be guided by those who sat on that (the Opposition) side of the House, and who had special knowledge of the wants of the crofters.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words—"And this House humbly expresses its regret that the condition of affairs in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is very unsatisfactory; that the administration of the Law does not possess the confidence of the people; that the Naval Forces are supposed to be required to overawe a portion of the population; and that the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the formation of new holdings, where they are urgently required."—(*Mr. Esslemont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) said, he did not think it was necessary to offer any evidence to show that the condition of things in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland was at present very unsatisfactory. They had got into a condition of discontent and disorder, and the people who had long been very loyal and law-abiding were now fast degenerating into anarchy and lawlessness. He thought it was time for the House to consider the causes which had brought about the present condition of things. There were two causes which had produced the present state of affairs. The first was, that the law had not been amended, and that the grievances which the people complained of had scarcely been affected by the Crofters Act; and, secondly, the administration of justice in the Highlands was anything but satisfactory. It did not possess the confidence of the people. They had two classes of officials in the Highlands connected with the administration of the law—the Sheriff, who was Judge of the county, and the Procurator Fiscal, who was Crown Prosecutor; and these officials had been using the power the law gave them for the purpose of oppressing and tyrannizing over the people. The Sheriffs generally belonged to the landlord class, their sympathies were with them, and they resented the attempt of the Highland people to get rid of their present grievances, and to get a more secure title to their holdings. The Procurator Fiscals were in almost every case agents or factors of the landlords, and they, too, who had been governing the people, and who had hitherto been little despots, strongly resisted the attempt of the people to shake themselves clear from this kind of domination. The Procurators Fiscal, therefore, had been using the terrible power which the Scotch law placed in their hands to tyrannize over the people. He had often heard hon. Members from Ireland complaining of the powers which the Coercion Acts gave the officials in Ireland; but similarly stringent powers were being constantly enforced by the Sheriffs and the Procurators Fiscal against the people of the Highlands. He would give a few illustrations of the way in which the officials used their power. The first case was one which even the Lord Advocate would not be able to support—that of the Rev. Mr. Armour, of Sanday, a gentleman of three score and ten, who had been the champion of the people. Last year he went to a meeting of the Conservative candidate for the purpose of asking some questions. The first was whether the candidate would support Lord Randolph Churchill and the Tories in their obstructive policy. The second was whether he would represent the people or the landlords in Parliament. Beforehand, some of the supporters of the Conservative candidate determined to put down the leader of the people, if he rose, by making a noise or by laying hands on him. The result was there was a little disorder, and the chairman had to close the meeting. The Fiscal was a Tory, and the Sheriff was a Tory, and instead of prosecuting Mr. Harvey, who disturbed the meeting, they actually prosecuted this rev. gentleman, who rose for the purpose of asking a question. The Fiscal—this very just Crown Prosecutor—actually had the audacity to tell the Sheriff that the rev. gentleman when he rose was out of order. He would read the summing up of the Sheriff, who sentenced this poor man to four days' imprisonment for the terrible crime of putting impertinent questions to the Conservative candidate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The facts that the hon. Gentleman is now stating have no reference whatever to the Amendment.

Dr. CLARK said, he was wanting to point out that in this district they had no middle class—only the crofters.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the case had no reference whatever to the subject before the House, and he asked the hon. Member to keep within the terms of the Amendment.

Dr. CLARK said, he might be allowed to take another case—that of the Procurator Fiscal in his own county. There were two fires after the late Election, and this Procurator Fiscal asked two gentlemen to give evidence as to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have again to call the hon. Gentleman to Order. What he is now stating has no reference whatever to the Amendment before the House.

Dr. CLARK said, that one of the clauses of the Amendment was that the administration of the law in the Highlands did not possess the confidence of the people——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry again to have to interrupt the hon. Member. I would point out to him that the whole question of the administration of justice in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is not covered by the Amendment. It is the administration of justice so far as the crofters are concerned. The whole point of the Amendment is the Crofters Question.

Dr. CLARK said, he desired to show that the crofters in his county were sent to Dingwall Prison for 66 days without having even been tried because of their political opinions, and it was only after considerable pressure that the right hon. Gentleman the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) was got to interfere. But perhaps he (Dr. Clark) might be permitted to say something about Sheriff Ivory, who in virtue of his office as Sheriff had committed what in Scotland they called crimes, and for which he would be liable to two years' imprisonment; yet he still remained Sheriff of the county. He desired to say something about the Tiree case. It was supposed that they required in Tiree at present gunboats and marines for the purpose of overawing the population, and that they had a condition of things in Tiree which was very bad indeed. But he wanted to point out that this was not the case, and that the people of Tiree did not require either gunboats or marines, although they were very glad to have them, as they found among them a market for their produce. The result was that the crofters would be more comfortable and richer after the marines had left than before. It had really been a blessing to send the gunboats and marines to Tiree. The Island of Tiree was typical of the general condition of things in the Highlands. The population of Tiree was about 2,700 people. The rental was about £5,300 a-year. The distribution of the land and the condition of things in Tiree would show how utterly inadequate were the remedies of the Crofters Act to meet the grievances the people complained of. About 35 per cent of the rental of Tiree was paid by three persons—a farmer taken from Ayrshire, with three large farms, the factor, and the factor's brother paid over one-third of the rental; a dozen men paid over one-half of the rental; and the remainder was paid by 208 crofter families; while in addition to these there were 320 cottar families, who had no land at all, and who, under the Crofters Act, would still remain landless. The entire number of crofters and families were only about 220. The Duke of Argyll had seen fit to consolidate the crofts, to make large farms, and these men had been petitioning him to get back a large portion of their crofts and a large portion of their grazing lands. They thought when the Crofters Act was passed probably the Duke might be able to give them some of the farms when they became vacant. One farm—the farm of Greenhill—became vacant lately, and they petitioned for that. Generally speaking, they got no reply at all to their petition, and the branch of the Land League Reform Association down there took it upon themselves to act illegally. When this farm became vacant the chairman of that branch, who was an old bachelor, and lived with his brother on a large croft, used very strong language to deter anyone from applying for it, saying that anyone who did so ought to be hung. The result was that the brother applied for the farm. The people were naturally irritated at this sharp practice, and determined to express disapprobation by acts perhaps not legal. The consequence was that a Sheriff's officer was sent to serve writs upon them. He was accompanied by a man whom the islanders thought had turned traitor. This made them rather angry, and they were now told that the Sheriff officer was deforced, and that marines and gunboats were necessary in order to have the writs served. The Sheriff officer might have been deforced, but they wanted much more evidence than had yet been adduced to show that. Two of the men who were now in prison were miles away when the deforcing—if any at all—took place. Some three or four years ago they had a case of alleged deforcement in the Island of Skye; but it ended in a summary conviction for simple assault, though the Sheriff in that case also wanted gunboats, and marines, and all the rest of it. By-and-bye, when the Tiree case was tried, they should find that the same thing occurred, and that there had been simply misrepresentation. Of course, they knew what had caused it. There was a paper published in Edinburgh which published an account of what was supposed to have taken place. It misrepresented all the facts. It spoke of the people firing from behind hedges. There were no hedges at all in Tiree. He would not characterize that journal in the language used by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Scotland (Mr. J. P. B. Robertson), and talk of it as an illiterate and mendacious journal; but, undoubtedly, its reports were fearfully and wonderfully compounded, and this was one of the reports which had been shown to misrepresent this law-abiding people of the Highlands, and to give them a bad character. The Crofters Act would have very little effect in Tiree. All the large farms were under lease, so that 208 crofters could not get an extension of the holdings, and the 300 odd cottars could not, under any circumstances, get an extension of their holdings, because the Act would not permit it. In reference to the action of the administration of the law, the Fiscal who went to Tiree, and was one of the agents to the Duke of Argyll, and father-in-law of Mr. John Campbell, the Duke's factor, had himself held, and might still have, an interest in one of the large farms in the Island; yet this was the gentleman who was being sent to report, and upon whose evidence these men had been imprisoned. With reference to the last clause of the Amendment, some hon. Gentlemen were under the impression that the real grievance of the Highland people was rack-rent. He thought, on the whole, the Crofter Commissioners in their Report stated what was the accurate condition of things, that only perhaps on four estates in the whole Highlands they had got to pay rack-rents. Outside that, the real grievance was the want of land. Taking Sutherland as a typical crofter county, last year out of 3,000 crofters 1,200 only paid an average of about 25*s.* a-year rental. If they reduced it to 12*s.* 6*d.*, what effect would that have upon the comfort of the Sutherland crofters? Their present rental was not 6*d.* a-week, and if they reduced it to 3*d.* a-week it would only be the price of an ounce of tobacco. When the Crofters Bill was introduced, he (Dr. Clark) then pressed on the Government that the one question was that of the enlargement of holdings. The crofters had been driven away from the land; and in reference to Tiree, it might be desirable to give the House an idea of the process and method by which the population of the Island had been reduced during the last 30 or 40 years from 4,000 to 2,700, and especially on the estate of the great Duke of Argyll. [The hon. Gentleman proceeded to quote from the evidence laid before the Royal Commission instances of cases of eviction, under harsh circumstances and no alleged good reason, in which crofters' houses and barns had been unroofed, and the other inhabitants forbidden to give them one night's shelter under pain of like treatment, one woman so evicted being confined on the cart which took her away, while another person similarly turned out of his home had been thrown on the parish, which had since supported him at a cost of upwards of £600.] This Island was one of the places where there was rack-renting, and where the rents were paid, not from the crofts, but from the earnings of the children away in the cities in the South. The evidence given also showed that the cottars' children were unable to get milk, and were physically degenerating. Another point on which no action was taken was the truck system. In some parts the people were accustomed to burn kelp, and for this they were paid, according to the evidence, £2 in money or £4 in goods. The truck system still prevailed in many parts of the Highlands, and the Procurator Fiscal was in many cases the agent of the employer. On these and other grounds they asked that this House would try to remedy some of the grievances of these poor people. They had been driven away from the most fertile portions of the territory where there was now large deer forests like that of Mr. Winan's, in which there were 300 square miles for himself and his gillies, while the people were driven away to the islands and the sea-coast. There they tried to do an impossible thing—they tried to make a fair living on land that was neither sufficient in quantity nor good enough in quality to enable them to make a living; and all they asked was that they should have an opportunity of dwelling on their own land which was now misused—he said misused, for although this system of creating deer forests and making large sheep tracks had paid when it was begun, the landlords had soon discovered that the grass which the crofter had created passed away, and was replaced by rushes and heather, and the farms that were formerly able to hold 10,000 sheep, were able now to take no more than 5,000. All they asked was that, in Scotland, they should be able to return to the land tilled by their fathers—the land that was hallowed and rendered sacred to them by many recollections and associations of which they were proud, instead of being driven to Manitoba and other places. The question now was whether this House would compel those people to fall into lawlessness, anarchy, and distress, or whether their just grievances would be remedied and they would be enabled to live on equitable terms in their own land.

Mr. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham) said, he was desirous of saying a few words upon the question raised by the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark), as he (Mr. Baumann) had happened to be in the Highlands at the time of what was known as the deforcement in Tiree. He thought that the House must make considerable deductions from the evidence which had been read by the hon. Member for Caithness when they remembered that it was uncross-examined evidence. Upon one point, however, they luckily had some counter evidence on the question of Tiree from the proprietor of the Island, the Duke of Argyll, which differed very much from the account which the hon. Member for Caithness had laid before the House. The impression which the hon. Member had striven to make was that the Duke of Argyll had evicted his tenants from small holdings in order to make large farms. This was by no means the case. But hon. Members might like to hear the facts. There were 30 farms upon the Island of Tiree, and of these all but one or two had been divided among crofters and small farmers below the £100 limit of rental. There were 2,500 acres of arable land divided into crofts and small farms; while there were only 450 acres devoted to larger farms, and there was only one farm which paid a rent of £500 per year. Therefore, there was only one which they in England would call a large farm. Besides the 2,500 arable acres the small farmers and crofters in Tiree had about 2,000 acres of outfield land or green pasture, exclusive of link land, which was very fine grazing land, and other rougher land. He thought, then, hon. Members would therefore see that the Duke of Argyll had not dealt harshly with the tenants in the Island of Tiree. [*Laughter.*] He did not know why hon. Members opposite should laugh at that statement. He was perfectly ready to go into the history of the Island of Tiree, and it would be seen that previous Dukes of Argyll had tried the experiment of sub-division with the most disastrous results, because the processes of population and sub-division proceeded with such simultaneity, that the greatest destitution prevailed in the Island until the famine of 1846. Nothing could exceed the philanthropy and generosity of the Duke of Argyll to the people of Tiree during the famine of 1846. Out of his own pocket the Duke defrayed the cost of emigrating several families to Canada; and he not only did that, but he gave them the means of starting life afresh in the Dominion. Several of these families were met by Lord Lorne, when he was Governor General, in a happy and prosperous condition in Canada. [*Laughter.*] He observed that this conduct on the part of the Duke of Argyll was received by hon. Members opposite with jeers. He knew that it was the policy of hon. Members opposite to root a pauper population to the soil—and naturally, because if all this discontent were to cease, where would their clients be? He knew also that they had borrowed from Henry George the silly doctrine that it was every man's right to live and thrive on the soil of the land of his birth, and endeavoured to persuade the people to live on their wretched holdings instead of seeking a land where they could push their fortunes. The Duke of Argyll had been able to show the Commissioners the year before last that he had been able to create a class of small farms without having to resort to unjust, needless, or oppressive evictions. With regard to the particular case of the deforcement in Tiree, the hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. Mc.Laren) had doubted the necessity of what he had been pleased to call the naval demonstration; but it was the fact that 75 people had simply squatted on the farm of Greenhill, and taken forcible possession of it. Far be it from him to cast any imputation on the courage of that band of 50 commissionaires and policemen, who, under Captain Mackay, on the 21st July, had marched through the Island and succeeded in serving five out of the 75 notices of interdict. But he was disposed to agree with the hon. Member for Caithness that those 75 notices might have been served without serious consequences, though, no doubt, when ladies took off their stockings and filled them with pebbles from the sea-shore the situation was decidedly serious. But the crowd had never exceeded 250 or 300 persons, unarmed; and he was inclined to think that the notices might have been served without having recourse to the gunboats and marines. But a deforcement had been effected, and the police had been forced to retire; and knowing the fundamental principle of the Liberal Party to be the abatement of disorder and the restoration of peace by the abandonment of the law, everybody had thought that the Land League in Tiree had secured a complete triumph, and were to be left in unlawful possession of another man's land. But, unfortunately for the people of Tiree, they had no able editors to write concerning their wrongs; the leading Scotch journals had been all against them; they had no fluent orator to plead their cause with the public, although there was a rumour that the yacht of the late Member for Argyllshire (Mr. Macfarlane) was in the neighbourhood, and the whole Island was thrown into an ecstacy of expectation by the rumoured appointment of Mr. Macfarlane. But although the unhappy islanders had watched far into the night for his venerable form, he had never come, and instead of that man of peace there had appeared two men-of-war, with their old friends the police and 250 marines. The reception of the soldiers by the islanders of Tiree had been remarkable, as showing, in the first place, how easy always was the prompt and fearless execution of the law, and how really contemptible was the power of the Land League—at any rate in Scotland—if promptly and firmly dealt with. The islanders had received the marines with open arms, and if the masses and classes of Tiree were against the soldiers, at any rate the lasses had been on their side, as the women had provided them with honey and other things. Of course, the remaining 70 notices of interdict had been served without the slightest difficulty, the unlawful occupants had been cleared off the farm, and the whole episode was an admirable instance of how easy it was to enforce the law by a mere bloodless display of that force which it was one of the fundamental principles of the Liberal Party to regard as no remedy. At length there appeared a speck on the horizon in the person of the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark), who took the chair at a meeting held in Glasgow in the month of August, when he applied the following language to the Duke of Argyll—language, which, considering the facts of the case, the House would agree with him in describing as scandalous and outrageous language. The hon. Gentleman was reported to have said—

> "The MacCallum More was well known to have been a great thief and robber. His worthy descendant was playing the same game in the modern 19th century style. This elder of the Kirk, this sanctimonious prig, this pedantic priest of a played out political gospel, who preaches the glory of grab and practices it."

Dr. CLARK (Caithness): The quotation is not accurate.

Mr. BAUMANN said, of course he accepted the explanation of the hon. Member; but, at the same time, he wished to remark in his own defence, as well as in that of *The Scotsman*, that these phrases bore the distinct mark of literary preparation. Perhaps the hon. Member——

Dr. CLARK: I rise to Order. The hon. Member ought to be aware that after the report appeared I write to *The Scotsman* newspaper pointing out the inaccuracies in the report. I do not do it now for the first time.

Mr. BAUMANN said, that he should be glad to know whether the report was inaccurate in substance or only in form? He wished to know whether the hon. Member wished to convey to his audience that the Duke of Argyll was a robber and a thief?

Dr. CLARK: I did wish to convey to the audience that the Duke of Argyll was virtually a robber by law.

Mr. BAUMANN: Quite so; the report in *The Scotsman* newspaper, therefore, was not so inaccurate after all in attributing rather apt alliteration to the hon. Member for Caithness. They now knew that the hon. Member wished to impress upon his audience that the Duke of Argyll was a robber and thief. He (Mr. Baumann) had no personal acquaintance with the Duke of Argyll or with any member of his family; but he respected his erudition, he admired his eloquence, and he remembered his long services to his country in successive Administrations; he admired his unaffected piety, and the courageous sincerity of his convictions. The Duke of Argyll was a great and worthy Noble. He hoped he had no undue or exaggerated regard for rank or wealth as such; but he maintained it was simply monstrous that any man, "be he duke or ditcher," should, in the exercise of his legal rights and in the mere defence of his property, be assailed with such rancorous ribaldry by an hon. Member of that House. If the Duke of Argyll had been the most insignificant Member of that House, instead of being a Member of the other branch of the Legislature, the hon. Member for Caithness would never have dared to apply to him such vulgar and venomous scurrility.

Dr. CLARK: I rise to Order, Sir. I wish to ask if "vulgar and venomous scurrility" is Parliamentary language?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is referring to some language used outside the House; but if he, as a Member of this House, charges the hon. Member for Caithness with "vulgar and venomous scurrility," it is an expression which is not Parliamentary, and not suited to the dignity or the Forms of this House.

Mr. BAUMANN said, he submitted that the term "venomous scurrility" was not half so bad as that of "thief and robber," which the hon. Member admitted that he applied to the Duke of Argyll. He did not know why any man should be treated as a thief and a robber because he did that which they all tried to do every day — namely, enjoy the rights and property which the law allowed them to enjoy. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!"] He certainly should not withdraw. The expression he had used was an accurate description of the hon. Member's language. Of course, if the principle of private ownership in land——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member misunderstands me. I have said that the words in question—namely, the expression "vulgar and venomous scurrility—applied to an hon. Member of this House is one that ought not, and cannot, be properly used in this House. I hope the hon. Member will withdraw the expression.

Mr. BAUMANN said, he certainly had not understood that to be the ruling of the Chair, and he would at once withdraw the expression in deference to that ruling. It appeared to him, however, that Parliament should either prohibit private property in land by law, or discountenance the gross and exasperating abuse of landlords which they heard so much in and out of the House. No doubt, the condition of affairs in the Highlands was unsatisfactory, and there had been disorder and discontent. Who were the authors of the disorder and discontent that prevailed in the Highlands? For that, he was afraid, the ministers of the Free Kirk were in some degree responsible. They were naturally anxious and jealous lest anybody should shear their flocks but themselves, which they did pretty frequently and closely. The hon. Member for Caithness was responsible for some of the discontent; the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) was responsible; and he was afraid that his hon. and learned Friend (Sir John Gorst) who was now Under Secretary of State for India—praise God!— was responsible also for some of the discontent, for, of course, if his hon. and learned Friend would go on tours in Mr. Macfarlane's yacht there was no saying where he would be landed. He had frequently discussed the whole subject of the crofter population with Highland lairds of the best type—he did not mean gentlemen who appeared once a-year at the Northern meeting, or at the Caledonian ball, in a kilt, but gentlemen who sat with the tenants all the year round at parochial and school board meetings—and they one and all deplored the lamentable change in the character of the Highland population wrought by the emissaries of the Land League. The people had become a surly and discontented population; and the doctrine that they were to have the lairds' land for nothing had sunk deep into their minds. They were dimly conscious of the great fundamental principle of the Liberal Party—namely, that if you want to get a thing, no matter whether right or wrong, you have only got to kick the shins of the Government hard enough. So long as that was proclaimed to be a fundamental principle of legislation by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, there would be discontent and disorder, not only in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, in Ireland, and in Wales, but in every part of the United Kingdom. He had only to add that he was glad of the present opportunity of expressing his abhorrence and contempt of those political cormorants who thrived and fattened on the lowest passions of mankind, and who drove a roaring trade by stimulating their neighbours to a constant and continual breach of the eighth and tenth Commandments.

MR. PICTON (Leicester) said, that the hon. Member who had last addressed the House (Mr. Baumann) had made an exceedingly able speech; but, at the same time, he (Mr. Picton) was not sure that the hon. Member had been proceeding in the wisest groove on the Crofters Question. When they remembered the great grievances that were connected with it, and the amount of human suffering associated therewith, he could not but feel surprised at the tone of the hon. Member. The hon. Gentleman had not håd a good word to say of any section of humanity except Dukes and Lords. He, at the same time, thought it worth his while to attack the ministers of the Free Kirk. He stated that those ministers managed to fleece their flocks; but this was scarcely possible on the part of a ministry that were dependent upon their congregations for their income. He had thought, indeed, that the sacrifices which the Free Kirk ministers had made for their religion might have saved them from that taunt of the hon. Member. He did not wish to follow the example of the hon. Gentleman in regard to the remarks that he had made with reference to the Island and Highland population of Scotland; therefore he should not deal in unjust aspersions upon individuals, because they had only to deal with a system. What they urged was, that inasmuch as land was absolutely essential to the life of every man, and there was only a limited quantity, our law should take care that those who had a tenure in any portion of the surface should be compelled to hold it on conditions compatible with the good and happiness of the whole community. He believed that "live and let live" was the policy of the Highland Land League—the same policy that the National League of Ireland stood up for. There could be no doubt that the condition of affairs in the Islands and Highlands of Scotland was unsatisfactory. The crofter had asked for sufficient land to provide for the necessities of his family, and was refused. This, then, was the very gist, the very crux, of the whole question. The people had been driven from their old holdings, and they were living scattered along the sea-shore, where they were famished. The landlords held that it paid them better to let their lands for sheep, and that, in fact, human beings could not be supported there; but the crofters stated otherwise. They stated that they could make the lands let to them remunerative. The crofters did not want to rob the landlords; they were willing to pay them a reasonable rent for the land, and they maintained that they could make a living on the lands let for sheep walks. In other words, the crofters contended that the land should be held by the Scotch lairds in such a way as would make it capable of conferring benefit upon human beings, and not upon sheep and deer. The hon. Member for Camberwell stated that he had conversed with lairds upon the Crofters Question. Well, he (Mr. Picton) might state that he had conversed with Highland tenants in the parish of Lochalsh, and he found that within a generation or two where there was now a deer range there had been some 60 crofting families, who had since been driven to the sea-shore, or to Canada or elsewhere, and the total number of persons in these families could not be less than between 300 and 400. Why should not the same state of things exist at the present day? The crofters did not ask to go on the land for nothing. They were willing and able to do what they could with the land, which had in many places deep soil, and to pay a fair price for the use of it. He thought the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) had acted only in accordance with his duty in urging the House to adopt some declaration on this question. So far as regarded the enlargement of the crofters' holdings, the Act passed in the last Parliament had not done everything necessary to meet the just demands of the poor tenants, for the people in the Highlands would not rest satisfied, any more than the people in Ireland, so long as they were dissociated by the action of the landlords from the land on which they were born, and on which their forefathers flourished. The time had gone by when such savage measures could be adopted as were taken a generation or two past, when people were driven from their holdings, when their roofs were fired, their homes pulled down upon their heads, and the sick and the dying were turned out on the roadsides. These things could not be done at the present day. They would shortly find that in the North of Scotland there was a little Ireland; and, although a small section of discontented people, they could make it very uncomfortable for any Government, as did the discontented people on the other side of the Irish Sea. The crofters had now reason to complain of the deer running down from the deer parks, to the great injury of the tenants. The 13th section of the Crofters Act attempted to deal with this matter. What was the advantage of having deer parks at all if it were not for the number of gillies that found employment in connection with their support? That was a kind of menial occupation, compared with a free life on a man's own land. This was a case in which the land was being used in the interest of the few, and in opposition to the welfare and even the lives of the people. He should like to know how many enjoyed the sport of deer-stalking? He doubted if more than 1,000 persons, including the menials who were employed in looking after the guns and driving the deer, enjoyed the sport of deer-stalking as it was called. What was the extent of the lands which were used for the purposes of this recreation or sport? According to the Report of the Royal Commissioners, no less than 2,000,000 acres of land were set apart for deer parks. To his mind, it was something terrible to think that that land should be squandered and wasted in this way, especially when the people declared that, if allowed, they could make their living out of it. It had been stated that only deer would pay upon the ground now occupied by them in the Highlands of Scotland. He believed that there was no doubt of the fact that where deer could live there also cattle could live. It had been stated that sheep could not prosper, because they would require wintering; but so did deer also require wintering. Indeed, it was possible for one to see, in some parts of the Highlands, hay actually left uncut for the wintering of deer. ["Oh!"] Now, hon. Members might cry out "Oh!" but he declared it was a fact that at the head of Loch Duich might be seen hay upon Mr. Winan's property, the hay being preserved for the wintering of his deer. He thought that no more sad spectacle could be seen than land given up to the use of deer that could provide for human beings in happiness and comfort. It was that kind of thing that they were bolstering up and favouring by the moderate and half-measures of land reform in the Highlands. It was high time that the thing was taken in hand thoroughly. He had confidence that the noble Lord who represented the Government in the House, whatever might have been some of his defects in the past, understood the true interests of the people; and he read the noble Lord's past history wrongly unless he had the courage likewise to follow out any convictions at which he had arrived. Stranger things had happened in the past than that a Tory Minister should devote his energies to defend the rights of the people; and he, therefore, relied upon the noble Lord to secure the welfare of the poor crofters, who looked to the land for their sustenance, while, at the same time, he preserved the fair rights of the landowners. It had been pointed out and laid down by Joshua Williams and other legal authorities that no man could have absolute property in land. All that he could claim was a tenure, and he was only entitled to that tenure on condition that it was worked to the advantage of the whole community. He had much pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

Mr. MASON (Lanark, Mid) said, that anyone who had visited the Highlands and Islands must have seen for himself that there was great suffering amongst the great body of the people. The condition of the Highlands and

Islands, as the Amendment stated, was very unsatisfactory, notwithstanding the Act which was passed last Session. He desired to address the House with regard to the Island of Arran, in which he had recently an opportunity of witnessing the condition of affairs, and could speak from personal observations. Arran was, perhaps, the grandest of the Islands in the West of Scotland. It was fertile and salubrious. It possessed numerous material resources—coal, freestone, slate and ironstone. Fish abounded on its shores; but, although the Island was such a magnificent one, the population did not exceed something like 6,000 souls, and the rental did not exceed £11,000 per annum. There were no artificial harbours of refuge, and there were no tramways in the Island. He made these statements thinking that the Government in power, evidently a benevolent Government, would think a little of the condition of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and would give a portion of the money they were going to lavish upon the development of the material resources of Ireland to Scotland. It was, of course, very easy to be very benevolent out of other people's pockets, and the taxpayers might have something to say with reference to the money the Tory Government proposed to spend in developing the material resources of Ireland, and to show there was a better way of developing the resources and improving the condition of the people than by the way proposed by the Government. The inhabitants of Arran were chiefly engaged in agriculture, and the farmers were poor. They were dependent almost entirely upon their landlord. He need hardly state that the landlord was the Duke of Hamilton, who was almost the sole proprietor of the Island. There were no leases given to the tenants, who were yearly occupants. The rents were largely paid, not by the fruits of the soil, but by the money received from visitors from Glasgow, in the summer months, and who went to Arran in large numbers, and paid high rents for the miserable dwellings they occupied. These people were attracted by the beauty of the scenery and the salubrity of the climate. If capital were to flow into the Island, it could now be made into a paradise. But the people were poor, and why? Because there was no security for capital. The tenant had no security whatever if he laid out £100 that he should ever see 1*s*. of it again. As he had said, there were no leases given to the tenants, and the proprietor of the Island positively refused to either sell or feu any land for building purposes. The result was that these wretched houses, in which the poor people were compelled to dwell, and for which they received large sums from visitors in the summer time, were not equal in many respects to the stables of right hon. Gentlemen opposite, in London or elsewhere. That was a condition of things which ought not to exist in this country. He, a few weeks ago, conversed with the poor people themselves. [*Interruption.*] The Secretary for Scotland cheered. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not.] Well, at all events, those on the other side cheered; but if the Secretary for Scotland were to visit Arran and entered one of the houses of the poor people, such a tall man, if he desired to stretch himself, would have to put his feet out at the window. His (Mr. Mason's) family were staying in the Island lately, and to his surprise he found that all the vegetables they required from day to day came from Glasgow, even although Arran had a magnificent climate and a good soil. The reason for this was, the farmers said, there was no use planting vegetables in the early spring, because the deer would come over the hills and devour every plant they put in. The Island was practically a deer forest, for in the spring months, after the crops were sown, the farmers were obliged to sit up and watch night after night, and this guard had to be repeated in the harvest time. Such was the condition of the people — a condition of things resulting from the fact that the Island was in the hands of one proprietor, and that the landlord took an exceptional and peculiar view of the duties which were required as to the land. The Crofters Act was passed for the purpose of improving the condition of the people in the Highlands and Islands; but the Act did not include Arran, although attempts were made in the House to make the Act apply to that Island. It would have been a benefit if they had got Arran included in the Act; but it would have been a greater benefit still if they had been able to carry the clause giving the cottars the same advantages as the crofters. A clause had been carried in the House of Commons giving to cottars the privileges of the Act without compelling them to reside upon the land, which was struck out of the Bill by the House of Lords. That had not been forgotten, nor likely to be forgotten, by the people of Scotland. The farmers in Arran, in conversation, did not complain personally of the Duke of Hamilton. He was regarded as a kindly, genial-hearted landlord, and they spoke well of him; but he was not often there. He only resided in Arran three or four weeks in the year, and he came North for the purpose of killing grouse, and enjoying sport in shooting the deer which he kept in such large numbers. The farmers, he repeated, spoke kindly of the Duke, and carefully also, for of course they were dependent upon him, and said nothing against him. The boatmen down at the shore were much more outspoken, and, while they said nothing bad about the Duke, were not afraid of him; but they said that the people of Arran were in terror of those under the Duke, and were in terror of saying anything or doing anything which would in any way give offence to the Duke or those serving under him. The Native population of Arran were industrious, hard-working, and thrifty; and he believed that, with proper security for the outlay of capital, the development of the material resources of that beautiful Island would go forward with leaps and bounds. He had not the slightest doubt but that the rental of the Island could be increased tenfold in a few years, and that the population, instead of being 6,000, might be 50,000, 60,000, or 100,000. Property had its duties as well as its privileges. He feared that its privileges, such as he had been describing, had been very much abused, and that the duties had been very much neglected. What was wanted as a remedy was a thorough reform of the Land Laws. That lay at the root of the whole matter; and if those proprietors, such as he had described, would not grant proper facilities, and be wise in time, then he thought Parliament would be perfectly justified in stepping in and compelling them to do so. The time had come when a thorough reform of the Land Laws was absolutely required for the accommodation and the comfort of the increased population, and the well-being of the inhabitants of the country. He never was in favour of the proposal which had been made to confer upon Local Bodies the power to acquire land for granting allotments. He thought the proper course would be to give Local Bodies power to compel reluctant and unwilling landlords to sell to willing purchasers at a fair valuation, and thus responsibility would be taken entirely off the hands of the ratepayers. The Crofters Act was not at all satisfactory to the people of Scotland. They regarded it as a mere step in a direction. It affirmed a very important principle, which he believed in a very few years they would drive home—namely, that this House was entitled to compel unwilling landlords to do their duty. Now, the way in which Scotch questions had been treated in this House had created a very strong feeling in Scotland that the Scotch people were not getting justice in Parliament. He could assure the House that there was a very strong feeling growing up amongst the Scotch people, and that they were determined to have the management of their own affairs. In other words, that they were going in for Home Rule. They had come to see that that House was being congested with work; that there ought to be devolution; and that Scotch local affairs should be settled in Scotland, and not at Westminster.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remarks of the hon. Gentleman have no reference to the Amendment now before the House.

Mr. MASON said, he was just finishing. His contention was that, if they had the management of their own affairs, they would have an improved Crofters Act. They would be enabled to accomplish that which that House did not give them; and, consequently, they were prepared for that purpose to join hands with those who were fighting the battle.

Mr. DALRYMPLE (Ipswich) said, he was induced to trouble the House with a few remarks, owing to the special subject which the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had taken under his protection. He did not think anything he could say would disturb the self-satisfaction of the hon. Gentleman in his treatment of the Land Question. But really the hon. Gentleman ought to recollect that people had been in Arran before him, and that those who had been connected with Arran for many years must be presumed to know a great deal more about it than he did. He did not think he ever heard, in the course of a speech made in that House, so many mis-statements on any subject as the hon. Gentleman had made in reference to Arran. He went into the geological and the scenic beauties of Arran in a very picturesque manner. He also went into the questions of population, property, and he (Mr. Dalrymple) knew not what besides, and in the course of his remarks indulged in what could only be described as romance in reference to Arran. He spoke of the small population in Arran. The House was probably not aware that a great portion of the Island of Arran was mountain and rock; and the only time in recent years that there had been anything like a decrease in the population of Arran was when a certain clearance took place in one part of the Island, greatly to the advantage of the Island, because it was well known that, from the peculiar character of the Island, intermarrying of the population had been such that the race was rapidly deteriorating. The hon. Gentleman spoke of there being no piers and harbours; but within his (Mr. Dalrymple's) own knowledge, during the years he represented the county, several piers had been erected, and at least one was in process of erection at the present time. Then the hon. Member said many of the farmers were very poor. No doubt, many of the holdings might be poor, but there was plenty of money in Arran; and it was well known to those who knew the circumstances of the Island that it would have been greatly injured, instead of being benefited, if it had been put under the Crofters Act. There were leases in many cases. In the smaller holdings there were no leases; but it was well known that the system suited the people there, and the proof of the success of the system was that hardly anyone was ever disturbed in his holding, but that the people were there from generation to generation. They were safe in the hands of the proprietor, and they knew it well. The hon. Gentleman spoke of the wretched dwellings in Arran; but it was strange, if that were so, that during the summer, as he himself said, they were occupied by Glasgow people. And he might mention here, in reference to the charge against the landlord of Arran of refusing building leases, the reply of the late Duke of Hamilton, that if he allowed everyone to build in Arran his people would not be able to make their rents in summer from the people of Glasgow. The hon. Gentleman had evidently picked up his knowledge of Arran from some persons on shore; but he would remind the hon. Member that persons resident for a short time in a place were liable to be gulled. Although exceptional in its circumstances, still it was wonderful how prosperous the small holders in Arran were; and he ventured to say that the great bulk of the tenants there would tell the hon. Member that they would be very sorry to have any change. He doubted whether much benefit would accrue to the crofters and small holders of land in Scotland from this discussion. No one supposed the Crofters' Question would be re-opened again immediately; and, at the same time, he did not believe there was a man in the House who would not do what he could to benefit the occupants of small holdings in Scotland if a real case could be made out for legislation, and not propounded on fanciful and rhetorical descriptions such as those in which the hon. Gentleman had indulged.

Mr. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) said, that the Irish interest in the debate was owing to the circumstance that the environment of the difficulty of the peasantry of Ireland was very similar in some respects to that of the crofters. His Party altogether agreed with the Amendment. Complaints were often made that the time of the House was wasted. Amendments were suggested last year to the Crofters Bill by Members who understood the question, and these Amendments were neglected and defeated. That was the reason they were now discussing this subject. A chord was struck in the breast of every Irishman by the part of the Amendment which referred to the use of the Naval Forces to overawe the population of Tiree. They had witnessed the Forces of the Crown used in Ireland for the terrible purposes of eviction. It was an unfortunate state of matters that it should be necessary, in order to get grievances removed, to drive the people to the brink of armed revolution. It was a terrible state of matters that the experience of the House should teach that it was necessary there should be a terrible agitation abroad, and an almost total suspension of Business in that House, in order to compel the obstinate supporters of landlordism to recognize the justice of a case and amend the laws complained of. The Highlands and Islands of Scotland had been their recruiting grounds, and the illustrations of Tel-el-Kebir showed a Scotchman leading the assault on the ramparts; but if the policy of the Duke of Argyll were to be carried out fully, where would they obtain their Scottish recruits in the future? The opponents of the Government had been twitted with the physiocratic heresy of Henry George. ["Hear, hear!"] He had to say that his Party did not deny all property in land, but believed in real property so regulated that it might be used for the greatest benefit of the people and the general prosperity. He had learned with astonishment that there existed in Scotland an Arms Act in perpetuity, and that men had been fined for being found with some old, rusty weapons. He had thought that Arms Acts were confined to Ireland. A fellow-feeling made one wondrous kind, and he was drawn irresistibly to the crofter when he found that he was persecuted for exercising the right of an Englishman and of a free man to possess arms. He had learned, also, that the crofters were retarded in their desire to marry. Now, he quite sympathized with Scottish Members who wished to remove these restrictions from the social condition of the crofter, and he would support the Amendment, because he thought it was just, that it was patriotic, and that it was conceived for the public advantage.

Mr. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) said, he would not have interposed in this debate but for the fact that he represented a constituency in which there were a great number of crofters. The hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Dalrymple) had asked them to tell the House the real grievances of the crofters upon this question, and then the House would consider them. Well, he had a real grievance to tell the House, which was this. He represented a constituency in which there were several hundred crofter tenants. These crofter tenants were hard-working men, who, out of the barren hillside, had made land which grew good crops. They had worked industriously and hardly, and in many cases he regretted to say that, having made their land fertile, the factors came round and put on a rent which ought never to have been permitted. To his mind, that was confiscation of the property of the crofter. There were other features in the crofters' position to be noted. They had to suffer if they did anything at all unsatisfactory to the laird, even of the landlords of the very best type, who appeared to be among the friends of the hon. Member for Camberwell (Mr. Baumann). With regard to the hon. Gentleman's remarks, it would be very amusing, indeed, in Scotland to hear that one of the Metropolitan Members had been informing the House of Commons of the conduct of the landlords of the best type, and giving his opinion of the conduct of the ministers of the Free Church of Scotland. It was a novel thing to find Metropolitan Members coming out on the Scotch platform. The general position of the crofters, he (Mr. Anderson) maintained, was a very hard one; because, having spent their industry and toil in making their land fertile, if they did not give satisfaction to the laird—and, of course, lairds were liable to be offended, like other human beings—they were turned out of their holdings without a single 6*d*. of compensation. He regretted to say that that was the position of the crofters whom he represented. Further, they wanted their holdings enlarged. In those counties there were enormous tracts of territory owned by some four or five individuals. The hon. Member for Camberwell had expressed astonishment that the lairds of the best type did not get on with the tenants of those great principalities. [Mr. Baumann: I did not say so.] He (Mr. Anderson) understood the hon. Member to say that the lairds of the best type had told him that there was some dreadful feeling existing among the Highlanders. One of the causes of that was that the lairds—even the lairds of the best type had the practice of despising the crofters. They looked at the crofters with —no, they very seldom looked at them at all—they did not know half-a-dozen of them by name, and in very few cases did they live amongst them. When some crofter wanted his holding enlarged and made an application to the factor, he was told—"Do not come to me for two or three acres. You will spoil the outlines of this beautiful domain. You cannot have it." Did the House think that the crofters had not the natural feeling of Scotchmen that the land of Scotland was intended, not for the lairds, but for the people? Even the hon. Member for Camberwell might have some doubt lest this feeling of dissatisfaction had some real and substantial ground. If the hon. Member went to the root of the matter, and mixed, not with his friends the lairds, but with the crofters, the tenant farmers, and the fishermen, he would come back from his next visit to the North impressed with the conviction that these people had the strongest grounds for complaint against even the very best of lairds. Now he came to the grievance which his constituents more especially suffered from. It was this—that although it was conceded by the last Parliament that the crofters of the county of Inverness were entitled to have certain rights and privileges—fixity of tenure in a modified form, fair rents, and power to increase their holdings—the same rights and privileges were not allowed to the crofters of Moray and Nairn. The three counties were mixed up, and the crofters were situated in exactly the same position; yet those in Moray and Nairn had not even the privileges given to their brethren over the Borders. He asked the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Dalrymple), who apparently had not been successful in recommending his views to his own countrymen, and had been obliged to come to an English constituency, whether that was not a real grievance? He had appealed to Her Majesty's Government. Yesterday he addressed a Question to the Secretary for Scotland asking the right hon. Gentleman if he did not think some legislation ought to take place for the purpose of introducing the crofters of Moray and Nairn into the Crofters Act; but he regretted to say that the answer was apparently that cold official answer which had come up to the present time from the Secretary for Scotland on all the points upon which he had been interrogated in that House. The right hon. Gentleman did not give a cold "No," but sheltered himself behind what was done in the House last Session. He (Mr. Anderson) did not share the feelings of the hon. Member for the Crewe Division of Cheshire (Mr. M'Laren), who seemed to expect great things from the Secretary for Scotland and from Her Majesty's Government on this subject; for he confessed that, when he heard that the important post of Secretary for Scotland had been confided to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. J. Balfour), he felt a feeling of dismay. He had taken the trouble to follow out the political career of the right hon. Gentleman on this question, and he found that he had taken a very prominent part in debates in that House—especially upon matters relating to the land—and he found, especially with regard to the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883, that he took the most prominent and active part, and, assisted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), who went by the name of the farmers' friend, had on every possible occasion tried in every way they could to cut and pare down the interests of the tenant farmers, and to support the interests of the landlords. He had occasion himself, during the recent contest, to mention the name of the right hon. Gentleman. He could not help telling him that when his constituents were informed that he had appeared in a debate in the House last Session as the champion of the owners of deer forests his name was not received with any flattery. He would recommend the right hon. Gentleman, if, after these discussions were at an end, he chose to pass his vacation in the Highlands and Islands, to go there under another name; because if there was anything which was abhorred and hated in the whole of the Highlands of Scotland it was the deer forests. He supposed the right hon. Gentleman would have the conduct of all legislation with regard to the land; but if the Government thought that the Scotch people would accept legislation with regard to the land upon the lines that the right hon. Gentleman had hitherto followed they were woefully mistaken. Land measures there must be, for the great question in Scotland was the Land Question. Perhaps it was presumptuous in him to give advice to the Government; but he would ask them not to suppose for a moment that because there had not been a rebellion in Scotland, because there had not been a refusal to pay rents —perhaps there had not been disorder in Morayshire—therefore there was not a very deeply-rooted feeling amongst

Scotchmen to have a far-reaching amendment of the Land Laws. He thought it was quite possible that on this question of the Scotch Land Laws there would be some serious matter presented for the consideration of the Government. On the Irish Question the Government seemed to consider themselves perfectly safe. On that question they had, unfortunately, the support of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) and other Members of the Liberal Party; but he (Mr. Anderson) would venture to throw out for the consideration of the Government that he did think, judging from the views expressed in Scotland by that right hon. Gentleman, that when the miserable land legislation which apparently seemed to possess the mind of the Secretary for Scotland was brought into the House, one of the first to condemn and vote against it would be the right hon. Member for West Birmingham. At least, he seriously hoped so, and he believed the people of Scotland hoped so too; because the right hon. Gentleman had discussed in Scotland the question of the land, and his views had been received there with acclamation, and he believed those views had not undergone any change. Therefore, it was not at all improbable that when the Land Question came to be dealt with, it might be thought right to lend to the Secretary for Scotland some of the larger and more far-reaching views which it was reputed possessed the noble Lord the Leader of the House and some other Members of the Government. He trusted the Secretary for Scotland would take what he had said in good part, as he meant it as friendly criticism on his past history; and he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to include the crofting counties he represented within the Crofting Bill of last Session.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) said, after the terrible picture given of the condition of the people in the Highlands of Scotland, there was no apology necessary to be granted to the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who last night sought to prevent the adjournment of the House in order that this debate should not have the due publicity which its merits deserved. He (Dr. Tanner) could not help feeling his heart sink at the terrible picture presented, regarding men who belonged to a kindred race with himself, whose sufferings he hoped would make them warmer friends of a nation equally oppressed. With reference to the speech of the hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Baumann), notwithstanding the defence contained in it of the Duke of Argyll by the hon. Member, he believed that the M'Callum More, great Nobleman as he was, had in that House been convicted and found guilty of dealing certainly not in a proper way with the tenantry of his estates on the North-West Coast of Scotland. They had instances enough of the state of affairs in Scotland of the tyranny of these landlords; and he asked, how long was it to exist? Were the Government going to take action, or were they merely going to sit on the Treasury Bench and draw the salaries to which they were entitled? Why should not the M'Callum More, like any man with a heart in his bosom, try to practise the great doctrine of "Live and let live?" He repeated that many instances had been cited of landlord tyranny and want of human feeling; and he asked whether the Government would take notice of this state of affairs? In his opinion, they ought to do something in the matter. It did not require a pair of spectacles or a microscope to see, as the Amendment stated, that the condition of affairs in the Islands and Highlands of Scotland was very unsatisfactory. Were they to go on allowing the people to be evicted? If Her Majesty's Government were to adjust these matters, it would be for the benefit of the landlords as well as the tenants. It was evident that the administration of the law did not possess the confidence of the people, seeing that the law was taken advantage of by one section, who were living like vultures on another section of the community. Her Majesty's Government ought to promote a policy of conciliation, instead of one of extermination. He maintained that the time was coming, if it was not already there, when Her Majesty's Ministers would be obliged to pay attention to the wants of the people. This was not an age in which men could simply sit on one side of the ditch and wait to see which way the cat would jump. The cat had already jumped. The democracy of Scotland, of Ireland, of Wales, and of a part of England—of Cornwall—were all in arms, and they were determined to see that justice was done to the masses. They were determined to no longer sit quietly and be trampled upon; and he would like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. Gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Bench what they were going to do on this occasion? Were they simply going to sit on the side of the ditch and wait? It would be better if they adopted a policy of conciliation, instead of promoting a policy of extermination; for in doing so they would place themselves in a right position in relation to a magnificent arm of the Empire, and place it in the position which it ought to occupy, instead of placing it in a contemptuous position. It brought to his mind the application of the moral of the old fable, describing in the case of the boys and the frogs that what might be sport to the former would be death to the latter. Although they were in that House, and it was the month of August, they were not there to promote sport; and all he had heard from the Scottish Representatives that night led him to say, in the same way, that these evictions in the Highlands, which might be sport to M'Callum More, *et hoc genus omne*, might be death to these poor crofter people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has been dealing very irrelevantly with the subject of the Amendment for some time, and it is now my duty to call his attention to the fact. I must also remind the hon. Member that a certain amount of courtesy is due from the Members of one branch of the Legislature to those of the other. The hon. Member has been alluding to a noble Duke in "another place" in a manner which violates the obligation of courtesy due from a Member of the House of Commons to a Member of the House of Lords.

DR. TANNER said, he would pass to the fourth part of the Amendment, from which it would appear that the most pressing grievances of the crofters had not been remedied by the Act of last Session. He considered that those who had no experience of eviction horrors talked in the most heartless manner about them. He would again remind the Government that they were in Office to do more than merely draw their salaries and sit on a Bench. They had a duty to perform in stopping unjustifiable and inhuman evictions, whether in Ireland or any other part of the United Kingdom. He deprecated such remedies as manacles and emigration for people suffering not mainly by their own fault. That was the natural point at which people would begin to have no confidence in the administration of the law. Bad laws badly carried out would not be productive of good. The crofters' law was inadequate to the ills of the crofters.

MR. SPEAKER again interposed, and said: I must call the attention of the House to the continued irrelevance and tedious repetition of the hon. Gentleman; and I must now ask him to resume his seat.

DR. TANNER thereupon resumed his seat.

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.) said, he regarded the subject raised by the Amendment as one of the most important that could be discussed in that House, or any other Representative Assembly. In it the question of the maintenance of social order and the interest of the public at large were deeply involved. It was a question that had caused disorder in every part of Her Majesty's Dominions. It had brought trouble upon India and Ireland, and now it had risen up in Scotland. He had spent a great many years of his life in studying the Land Question.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Gentleman that he is not applying himself to the discussion of the terms of the Amendment.

MR. HARRIS, having read the text of the Amendment, said, he would endeavour, as far as possible, to keep within its limits. He wished to say that he never wrote his speeches, and he urged that as an excuse on the present occasion if he should go beyond the terms of the Amendment. He hoped he would not go beyond the terms of the Amendment. He must say that the crofters were only asserting their rights, and he felt bound to express his satisfaction in the change of character evinced by the Highlanders, and which had been deplored by the hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Baumann). It was not the poor Highlanders who should be exterminated; but such men as the Duke of Argyll and the lairds, who were the worst revolutionists in clearing the country of its inhabitants, as the landlords did in Ireland, and substituting deer, and grouse, and black cock in their stead. He hoped the Highlanders would come forward like men and assert their rights. It was a question between brutes and men. Let the men assert their manhood. He hoped the crofters would continue to kick the shins of the Government, to use the simile employed by the hon. Member for Peckham, until their grievances were redressed.

An hon. MEMBER: I beg to move that the House be counted.

MR. SPEAKER ignoring the interruption,

The hon. MEMBER said: Mr. Speaker, I beg to direct your attention to the fact that there are not 40 Members present.

MR. SPEAKER: 40 Members are present.

MR. HARRIS, continuing, said, that in a contest between men and the brute creation the former must assert their manhood, and that was what they were doing in the Highlands. No hon. Member in that House had a higher regard for the rights of property than he had. But they must remember that property had its duties as well as its rights——

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to maintain some relevancy to the Amendment. This is the second time I have called attention to it.

MR. HARRIS said, that on this, as on all occasions, he bowed to the ruling of the Chair; but if the question of the rights of landlords was not involved in the question of the crofters he did not know what was. He wished to know whether the transportation of the people of Scotland, and the forcible diminution of their numbers, was a justifiable thing for the Government of this country to seek to effect? He would proceed to deal with the questions of emigration and taxation.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the House to the continued irrelevancy of the hon. Member. I have repeatedly warned the hon. Member, and I must now ask the hon. Member to resume his seat.

MR. HARRIS thereupon resumed his seat.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): Sir, if I may judge from the manner in which you have found it to be your duty to call the last two speakers who have addressed us to Order, I shall not be very far wrong in saying that probably all those in this House who have a right to address it, either from their knowledge of the subject, or from their connection with Scotland, and desire to do so, have already spoken. Therefore, I think it will probably be convenient to the House, and in the interests of Business, if I were to get up, even at this inconvenient hour, when the House is not usually full. A very large amount of ground has been traversed in the course of this debate. We have discussed the large question of Land Reform——

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): We could not discuss it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We have been engaged in discussing a large question of Land Reform, and we have travelled down from stage to stage until one hon. Member gave us some interesting biographical details about his stay in the Island of Arran. It is impossible, with any regard to the time of the House, that I should exhaustively discuss the various topics that have been brought before it; nor shall I be able to go fully into all the arguments that have been used. But before I give to the House an account of the general view which the Government take of this question, it will, perhaps, be convenient that I should allude to one or two of the remarks that have fallen from previous speakers. The hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont), who began this debate, avowedly did so in order rather to get over the technical difficulty that arose out of the events of last night than because he felt himself impelled to discuss the question of the crofters. Therefore, the only remark I have to take notice of was that in which he complained of the inadequacy of the Bill passed by the late Government last Session. The hon. Gentleman said the Bill was so inadequate, and it went such a little way towards redressing the grievances of the crofter population, that he expected the House would ere long have again to take up and reconsider the matter. I shall have some further remarks to make upon this part of the subject; but, in the meantime, let me remind the hon. Gentleman and the House that under the Bill of last year the crofters of Scotland are under a more favourable land system—if they estimated it by the number and magnitude of the rights which it removes from the landlord—I would say that the crofters of Scotland are under a more favourable land system at the present moment than the inhabitants of any country throughout the world, Ireland not excepted. You will search in vain the laws of Europe, America, or the Colonies, for any land system which gives to the tenants privileges such as those conferred on the crofters by the Bill of the late Government. If they do not sufficiently protect the rights and privileges of that class, all I can say is, that the tenants of England, of Scotland, of Ireland, France, Germany, America, and our Colonies, live under the most unjust system of land legislation ever devised by human beings. I have nothing to complain of in the tone of the observations made by the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton); but I think that although that hon. Member has not a profound knowledge of his subject, he spoke with the accents of true sincerity, and with a manifest and earnest desire that the condition of the class for whom he conceived himself to be speaking should be ameliorated if possible, and so far as he did that he deserved their thanks. If I might use the common expression, I would say that, although the hon. Gentleman's heart was in the right place, he had not any very adequate knowledge of the subject which he discussed. He seems to have derived his whole knowledge of the complicated and difficult question from an occasional stay in some island during the summer months, and has gained all the information he has from the gossip of a few shepherds and cottars. Anybody who knows anything of the Highlander must have been aware that, with all the charms and graces of his most interesting race, perfect, rigid, historical accuracy is not to be expected of him; and I think the hon. Gentleman would have done well if he had selected more authentic information than that he has quoted to the House. The hon. Gentleman has dwelt in passionate language upon the evil which has been inflicted on ancestors of the crofters by landlords two or three generations ago. I do not think the House is concerned with what has happened two or three generations ago. We cannot go back upon ancient wrongs. What we have to do is to consider the present condition of affairs, and the course to be adopted in justice and fairness to all existing interests. If the hon. Gentleman will look into the question of the Sutherland evictions, I am sure he will find that the transportation of the people from the interior to the sea coast was honestly and generously done in the interest of the people themselves. ["Oh, oh!"] Yes, Sir; they were transported from a place where they could not get their livelihood to one where they could, because at that time the kelp industry was in a flourishing condition; and it ought to be remembered that the proprietors of the Sutherland property spent, both before and after the evictions, more than the whole year's rental derived from the estates in support of the starving population who lived upon them. I think that facts like these ought to induce the hon. Gentleman to do common justice to those who are no longer here to defend themselves, even to a Highland landlord. But this question of transportation from the interior to the sea coast has no bearing upon the condition of the crofter population in the most disturbed districts at this moment. I would remind the hon. Member that there has been no transportation from the interior to the sea coast of the population in the case of Uist, and the Lewis, of Long Island, Skye, or Tiree. In the latter case, so far from being evicted from the holdings which they were possessed of two generations ago, the crofters received at that time holdings which they never had before. That should convince the hon. Member that statements about the Highland landlords, who were guilty of these removals, have very little reference to the present question. I will now say one word upon the question of deer forests. Most of the speakers who have alluded to this question have denounced me as the author of a clause adopted in the Bill of the late Government, by which they are pleased to say the deer forest system was bolstered up. Now, this is the clause which I got introduced—

> "If the land form part of a deer forest, and if the assignation of such land for the purpose of this Act would seriously impair the use of the remainder as a deer forest, and would act injuriously on the prosperity of the inhabitants

generally of the district in which such deer forest is situated."

The plain English of that is that where deer forests were for the benefit of the community at large—of crofters and cottars alike—there, and there only, should the deer forest cease to be subject to the provisions of this Act, which provided that land should be taken compulsorily for the extension of holdings. How the author of that clause can be described as one desirous of bolstering up a system inconsistent with the well-being of the inhabitants of the Highlands I am utterly unable to understand. There are districts in the Highlands which are fit for nothing on earth but letting for sporting purposes, for deer and game. They consist of rock and heather, which can by no possibility support either Highland cattle or crofters, and which, as sporting land, gives a larger support than otherwise they would have to the inhabitants of the district in the shape of wages, and also has otherwise the effect of bringing into the country an enormous quantity of wealth of Southern origin. How any man who is a friend of the crofters can object to such a system I am at a loss to understand. The hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. M'Laren), and the hon. Gentleman who followed (Dr. Clark), referred to the question of Procurators Fiscal and Sheriffs in Highland counties. As I am the only Member of the Government who is to address the House on this subject, I must point out that, though vague general accusations have been levelled against these officials, not a single specific case has been brought forward.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness): You ruled me out of Order, Sir, when I was bringing forward specific cases, such as that of Sheriff Mellis and others.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ruled the hon. Member out of Order because he was referring to the action of the Crown Prosecutor in an election case. I said that had nothing to do with anything connected with the Crofter Question, and the Procurators Fiscal could only be brought into the matter so far as their action bore on the Crofter Question, and that the case of the crofter constituted the whole point of the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The whole House were aware that had the hon. Gentleman a case to bring forward in which the Procurators Fiscal or the Sheriffs had been guilty in connection with the Land Question of malpractices you would not have ruled him out of Order. The hon. Gentleman brought forward no such case, and I think I have a right to assume that no such case exists. We have been told that the Procurator Fiscal is almost always a lawyer, who is in the employment, and very likely the actual agent, of some landlord. I do not deny that fact. I go farther, and I say that, in some respects, I regret the fact. But what is the alternative? You are dealing with counties in which the population is sparse, and the wealth is small, in which the number of persons who are competent to exercise the functions of Procurator Fiscal is extremely limited; and if you are to carry out the principle advocated by some hon. Gentlemen opposite, of saying that the Procurator Fiscal should be deprived of all private practice, you will inevitably find yourselves landed in this result—that the Procurators Fiscal in the future will be very inferior and very idle men. The work they have to perform is not in these districts adequate to fill up the time of one man; and even if you could find a lawyer of standing in no private practice, or who would give up his private practice and attend only to the work of the Procurator Fiscal, I believe the result of the idle life which you compel him to lead would be that the faculties which God had given him at the beginning of his office would shortly rust, and he would become utterly incompetent. While, therefore, I feel the force of the argument, I do not see how we can alter the existing system. The hon. Member for Crewe further said that the expenditure of public money in the way of loans to fishermen was the best, and, in some respects, the only method of benefiting the fishing population of the Highlands, and that he wished to see a large extension of the principle. He must be aware that provisions enabling the Treasury to grant loans to fishermen on the West Coast of Scotland are embodied in the Crofters Act. But the hon. Member desires that loans should be granted to fishermen all over Scotland. I entirely take up with the hon. Member's views; and I should be delighted to put my hand into the public purse and be able to scatter money from one end of Scotland to another for works of public benefit. But what would my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer say to that? Would the Treasury, would the House, and would the Representatives of English constituencies not resist any proceeding of the kind? And I appeal to the hon. Gentleman whether he is not endangering the loans we get from the Treasury now for the fishermen in the West Coast of Scotland, when he asks that the advantages which, by hard labour, my Predecessors in Office extracted from the Treasury shall be extended to other parts of Scotland? If this were to be done the result must be that the Representatives of the great towns in England, and in Scotland also, will ask what claim this particular population has for such exceptionally favourable treatment, and we may lose even the small advantages we have succeeded in obtaining. I observe that the main staple of the arguments that were used by hon. Gentlemen opposite consisted of abuse of the whole landlord system, and of landlords especially in the Highlands. It is on that frail foundation that hon. Gentlemen have largely built in their criticisms of what is at present going on in the Highlands. It fills me with melancholy to see the ignorance which is displayed by those who ought to know something very much more to the point than they do when they make these sentimental and oratorical attacks. I suppose that, in clouding the public vision on this question, it is not merely ignorance, but sentiment which has cooperated with ignorance, to prevent a true view being taken of the Crofter Question. We are all too much accustomed to look at Highland questions from a romantic point of view, through a mist of romance; and I observe hon. Members are in favour of extending the lenient judgment which we pass on the "Rob Roys" of the past to the more vulgar and violent acts of spoliation which are encouraged by the Land Leagues of the present. ["Oh, oh!"] But is this attack on the landlords justified by facts? It will, I think, be admitted that in America, in the Colonies, in Belgium, and wherever small freeholds exist, the owners of the freeholds treat them purely commercially, and attempt to extract from them all they can yield. The owners of land in America and abroad treat their land as a manufacturer treats his mills, as an Irish tenant treats his tenant right, and sells it, or lets it, to the highest bidder. I do not blame them. But this system, whether it is justifiable or not, is not the system which obtains in England or in Scotland, and, least of all, does it obtain in the Highlands of Scotland. There it is not, and it never has been, the practice for the landowner to look at his land merely as a source of profit. It can be proved by overwhelming evidence that they have been accustomed, as a class, to spend money upon their land for the benefit of the people, irrespective altogether of the returns in the shape of profit, and they have never, as a class, been guilty of exacting from the small tenants the full competition value of the land which is let to them. ["Oh, oh!"] Does any hon. Gentleman deny it?

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.): Yes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman who denies it is the same who was just now recommended to discontinue his address, owing to the fact that he was incapable of confining himself to the question. I would take, for example, the Sutherland property. I believe that, for generations, the whole rents of the property have been spent upon it. Only a few years ago the owner of the property spent £2,000 or £3,000 in public works on the estate. I believe in the Lewis every road in the Island has been made by the owner. The expenditure by the owner in various ways is at least £400,000. I do not think if you abolish landlordism, you will ever get private individuals, or the Government of this country, to spend any parallel sum.

Mr. HARRIS: How many farmers were evicted from the Sutherland estates?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Member had given me his attention he would have heard what I said. Even take the case of South Uist, which is one of the most disturbed districts. For years the owner of the property has spent the whole income derived from it in plans for the benefit of the people. I ask whether these, and many other facts of a similar nature which I could adduce, are not sufficient entirely to absolve landlords in these parts from any of the charges which have been levelled against them to-night? It has been said that rack rents largely prevail. The whole evidence we have, including the Report of the Crofters' Commission, goes directly to contradict the statement, and to show that crofts are rarely exposed, on a purely commercial principle, to competition in any form. With regard to the Island of Tiree, which I will take as an illustration, the hon. Member for Caithness said, and said truly, that while 12 individuals paid more than half the rent of Tiree, the remainder of the rent was paid by 208 crofters, and the hon. Member adduced from that fact that the system of landlordism in Tiree was monstrous. I, however, deduce from it a very different conclusion. The small tenants in Tiree rent very much the largest part of the Island; they rent also the best land in the Island. The actual portion that the crofters hold is 10,300 acres, and the large farmers have only 6,800 acres. Of arable land the crofters hold 3,700 acres, and the large farmers only 618 acres; so that if you consider the quality of the land as apart from its quantity, the case is stronger than I put it if you consider only quantity. Inasmuch as the crofters, therefore, hold much the largest portion of the arable land, there can be no doubt of the accuracy of the deduction that the landowners exact nothing like a competition rent for the land from the poor crofters.

Dr. CLARK asked on what authority the right hon. Gentleman made that statement?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have studied the map of the Island, and I know the acreage of all the holdings. I think that argument, apart from any other, ought to convince the House conclusively that, whatever other injury the crofters of Tiree suffer from, they do not suffer from the landlord putting up the crofts to competition rents.

Dr. CLARK said, he wished to remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Crofter Commission pointed out that in Tiree there was rack rent; and he himself, in his remarks, had stated that, generally speaking, they did not complain of rack rents in the Highlands, but that in four districts the Royal Commissioners found rack-renting—namely, in Tiree, a portion of Skye, in Caithness, and Orkney.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am aware of what the hon. Member has stated; but I think, nevertheless, that the facts I have given to the House, which cannot be disputed, dispose of the argument as to rack-renting in Tiree. I quite agree that there is a large part of the population in the Highlands who are in a very miserable and unhappy condition—not, perhaps, so bad as some hon. Gentlemen suppose; but still their position is far inferior to what this House would at all wish to see. The cause of that is not the rent exacted from them by the landlords. The truth is that the difficulty which has to be encountered in the Highlands is not a question arising out of the amount of rent; it is the question of population. I confess nothing gave me more pain to-night than to hear one speaker after another say he trusted the people would not emigrate, and that no effort should be made to induce them to do so, at the same time pouring contempt on those benevolent landlords who had spent money in promoting voluntary emigration and assisting emigrants with capital. Some things in politics are matters of speculation, while others are matters of certainty, and the proposition that I now assert is not a matter of speculation, but of certainty, and any hon. Gentleman can convince himself of that by no more formidable process of investigation than is supplied by the first four rules of arithmetic. If, in the Lewis, the land available for crofting were divided, not merely among the crofters, but the squatters also, it would, I believe, give a holding of only £5 annual value to each crofter, leaving no additional land whatever for the enlargement of existing holdings. The best authorities on the Highlands are agreed that if a man is to live by his croft alone, without supplementing it by wages, a £10 croft is the very smallest, and there are very few parts in the Highlands in which you can go beyond £20 crofts. That fact, therefore, shows conclusively that the distress among the crofter population can only be relieved by emigration. If the whole of Skye and the Long Island were divided among the crofters, excluding cottars, it would give them 19½ acres a-head; and the crofters themselves asserted before the Commission that 57 acres a-head was the smallest quantity on which they could live and thrive. Thus it is shown that the condition of the people of these Islands cannot be improved until you diminish their numbers, and so give room to the remainder to extend their holdings.

DR. CLARK asked whether the right hon. Gentleman calculated his estimate upon the requirements of a single man, or upon those of a man with wife and family?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it is based upon the requirements of a man with a wife and family; but, at all events, my statistics run on all fours, and, therefore, it makes no difference whatever for the substance of my argument. This being, broadly speaking, the true cause of the evil in the Highlands, to what is to be attributed the sudden agitation on this question which has arisen during the last five years? If any man had left this country six years ago, and had known nothing of what was passing here, and had now revisited Skye, Sutherland, Lewis, the Long Island, and Tiree, he would find it absolutely impossible to understand the strange change which had come over the whole face of society in that time. He would have left the population of those districts law-abiding, peaceable, and loyal. He would come back, and I am afraid, in too many cases, find them contemners of the law, victims of the Land League, determined not to pay their just debts to the landlord, and, indeed, very unwilling to pay just debts to anybody else. I am afraid we owe this, with many other blessings, to Ireland. ["Oh, oh!"] There can be no doubt that this agitation in the Highlands of Scotland had its origin in Ireland. The proof of that assertion may, I think, be conclusively established by the original pamphlets and the original placards which made their appearance in the early time of the agitation in 1881. But during the course of the last three or four years the question has been treated somewhat differently in the Highlands of Scotland to what it has been in Ireland. Each country has its own peculiarities, arising from the different characteristics of its population. In Ireland the agitation against the landlords has largely taken the complexion of a patriotic agitation, for if any person in that country desires to participate in that which is not legally his own he usually puts a patriotic complexion upon his agitation. There is, however, no Nationalist question as yet in the Highlands, and there the subject is taking a new and most interesting development. I would remind the House of the curious difference which exists between the arguments used in this House in support of the crofters, and the arguments which the crofters themselves believe in and are influenced by in the Highlands. The hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) repudiated, from his knowledge of the Land League, that they ever went in for the schemes of the Socialism of Henry George.

MR. PICTON: I said it was quite exceptional, and not the rule.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid the hon. Gentleman has given a very imperfect study to the periodical literature which is circulated in the Highlands. That literature bases the land agitation partly upon Scripture and partly upon the doctrines of Mr. Henry George; and I am bound to say that I do not know whether they misunderstand Scripture, or misunderstand Mr. Henry George more utterly and completely. The essence of the plan of Mr. Henry George is that the State should become a universal rack-renter of the tenant. [An hon. MEMBER: No!] Yes; I have read Mr. Henry George, if the hon. Member has not. Mr. George was of opinion that the land should be taken without compensation from the landlord, and so far I think the crofters agree with him; but he was of opinion, not that it should be given to the tenants, but that it should be let out on the highest competition rent to anybody who would bid for it; and if the facts I have submitted regarding rent in the Highlands have any foundation in truth, the position of the Highland crofter under Mr. George's system would be infinitely worse than under the present system. The truth is, that all these Socialistic schemes have two halves. By the first half, property is taken from the present owner; and by the second it is transferred to the State. I observe that the crofting population, and those who agitate it, entirely believe in the first part, but have no intention whatever of executing the second. I think it is only due to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leicester to refer to a speech of Mr. Donald Sinclair, President of the Tiree Land League, in which Mr. Sinclair announces that the "Tiree Land League does not stand alone, but has at its back the Land Restoration League." I may remind him that the principles of the Land Restoration League are very much those I have stated to the House. This Mr. Sinclair has had a chequered career. I observe that one of his admirers announced that he had laid it down as a condition of his becoming President of the Tiree League that its meetings should be opened and closed with prayer. I have no objections to that. And he says further—"All his actions and those of his fellow-crofters had been prompted by their interpretation of Scripture." Quite so; and, as I said before, it is partly from a misunderstanding of Scripture, and partly from a misunderstanding of Mr. George, that the theories in question have been founded. I attach the less weight to the particular interpretation which Mr. Sinclair places on Scripture from the fact that I understand that, not long ago, he was convicted of theft at Glasgow. I now come to the consideration of some of the particular outrages which have unfortunately taken place in the Highlands. I imagine that every man in the House, even if there be a Socialist present, is desirous that law and order should be maintained, and I therefore appeal to everyone to assist the Government in maintaining law and order. But I make this concession to the House. Some crimes there are which, though we feel bound to punish, we cannot feel it in our hearts to condemn. But are the outrages against law and order which are taking place, and which have taken place in the Islands of Scotland, of that character? Sir, from all the investigations I have made into this question, I am afraid I must say they are not. I have already told the House of what character is the landowner of the Island of Uist. She has spent for years and years, for the benefit of the Island, the whole income derived from the Island, and the rents have not been raised; and if any person deserved consideration at the hands of her tenants it would be her. Let me read an extract from a placard circulated in South Uist—

> "Rules for guidance in the struggle for freedom against landlord tyranny. Spare human life. Kill no man, except it be in self-defence. Destroy the enemy's property."

[An Irish MEMBER: Hear, hear!] There is still one hon. Gentleman who has the courage of his opinions.

> "The enemy is the landlord, the agent, the capitalist, and the Parliament which makes and maintains inhuman and iniquitous laws. Cut down the telegraph wires and posts; carry away the wires."

And so forth. And this is the advice which is circulated among the crofters of South Uist.

DR. CLARK: By whom?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman probably knows that much better than I do. They took that advice. Among other things, they cut down the telegraph wires. I and my Predecessors have always been urged by friends of the crofters to induce the Treasury and the Post Office to improve communication in the Highlands. Well, the telegraph in question was guaranteed by a subsidy from the owner of this property, and the people for whose benefit it was put up took the advice of th circular I have read, and proceeded t cut it down. Many other acts of violenc also occurred. Carriages were overturned and fences torn down, and the fences which enclosed a large area of land which had been reclaimed by the proprietrix were pulled down, and the crops upon it have been destroyed, and that part of the Island is rapidly returning to the condition of waste from which it was reclaimed for the benefit of the crofters. It will, perhaps, be said that the rents on this property are excessive, and that the people were driven, in spite of the liberality of the landlady, by poverty to these crimes. Here is the condition of one of these tenants in Benbecula, who has refused to pay rent for some years:—He is the fortunate owner of four cows, a heifer, two bullocks, three horses, a colt, and 17 sheep; and his rent is only £8. Here is one more:—His rent is £3 13*s.*; his stock is three cows, three bullocks, a horse, and a colt, yet he has not paid a farthing of rent for the last three years. But in truth, it does not require proof from me to show that the "No Rent" agitation in the Highlands is not the result of poverty, but the result of agitation, because we have it from the mouths of the agitators themselves. Their leaders have over and over again at public meetings advised the tenants not to pay, saying—"We can pay; but we decline to pay." In face of that fact, I defy anyone to say that poverty is the cause of this "No Rent" agitation. But the "No Rent" agitation has not been the sole manifestation of lawlessness in the Western Highlands. The crofters have on more than one occasion forcibly invaded land to which they had no legal title whatever, had broken down the fences, and had put their stock upon it. Take the case of the Braes, in Skye. There the tenants, for two generations at least, have never had anything to do with the farm lands; but, in consequence of the agitation, they suddenly determined to drive their stock upon it in spite of the landlord. In the interests of peace the landlord ultimately gave way. The farm had been let to a tenant at, I think, £135, and he agreed to let it to the insurgent crofters for about £75. How has that sacrifice been rewarded? The first year's rent was paid by, I think, some philanthropist in Glasgow. Not a single sixpence of the rent has been paid since, and at this moment the land is most inadequately stocked, and has only got upon it a few head of sheep belonging to the more prosperous of the crofting community of the Braes. What has occurred at Braes is borne out by what has occurred again at South Uist. There the owner became alive to the fact that the cry of "more land" was rife in the Highlands. She tried to meet that cry, and gave largely extended holdings, and broke up large farms to do so. She lost heavily in diminished rent by the process. That does not measure the extent of her losses, for no rent at all has been paid. The land is now lying idle, without being any good to the tenants, or to the community at large. In Tiree, without a single eviction, the extent of land belonging to each crofter has been increased during the present owner's management from 31 acres to 57 acres, or nearly doubled. There has not been a single eviction in Tiree during the last 40 years, except for non-payment of rent; and these increases in the holdings have been obtained either through voluntary emigration, or through families dying out. Whatever might be a justification for the illegal taking of land, poverty cannot be that justification; because unless the man can stock the land it is of no use to him. The result of the lawlessness which has prevailed is just what might have been expected. The crofters began by breaking their contracts with the landlord; they have gone on breaking their contracts with other people. Not only at this moment are rents in arrear in Skye at least two years, but rates are in arrear, and shopkeepers' debts remain unpaid. If a community is allowed to be wholly lawless in one particular, it cannot be expected to be law-abiding in others; the sore will inevitably spread; and as these people began with the idea that it was just to rob landlords, they now deem it no less justifiable to rob the community and their ordinary creditors. We are gradually becoming more familiar in the Highlands with all these dark phenomena with which we have been so long familiar in Ireland. The village tyrant is becoming a familiar phenomenon in the Highlands. There is peace there, for the same reason for which, as we are told, there is peace in some parts of Ireland; but I think it is quiet more nearly allied to social death than to repose. The House must think I have drawn a most gloomy picture of the state of society in the Highlands. No man feels it more than myself. I love, and have always loved, the Highland population. [*Laughter.*] I have known them from my youth; indeed, I have done what some hon. Gentlemen opposite have not done—lived among them—and I defy any man to live among them and not love them. I cannot deny that they have enemies, and these enemies, in the present crisis, have got the better of them. I do not think they are suffering from either bad Land Laws or bad landlords; and though I grant they have to contend with a barren soil, with inclement skies and stormy seas, yet neither soil, nor skies, nor seas are, in my opinion, the worst foes they have to contend with. My profound conviction is that their worst enemies are those who would throw the slightest impediment in the way of the superfluous population in these congested districts seeking in other climes a happier home. I am sorry to say some of those who profess to have most at heart the happiness of those people are most responsible for the prejudice, which is not of long standing, but which is now growing up, against a wholesome and a natural emigration. You may brave the laws of this House; if the laws be bad you may repeal or alter them; but you cannot brave or alter the laws of nature, and it is against the laws of nature alone that you struggle when you insist that a population shall live on land which cannot, by any possibility, be made to produce an adequate amount of food to support them. I look forward to time, and education, and the teaching of inevitable necessity gradually to remove these evils. If I could be instrumental in doing something more positively in regard to emigration I should wish to do it. I cannot at this moment see my way to do it; but I will consider the question. In the meanwhile, before the salutary effect which that emigration must produce comes upon us, I conceive that the duty of this House is plain. I am, as hon. Members are aware, no fanatical admirer of the Crofters Act. I have never pretended either that the principles embodied in that Act were sound principles, or that they would be of great benefit to the crofters in the direction in which they hoped to be benefited. But one advantage of that Bill I foresaw at the time, and experience has confirmed that view: it makes it quite certain that we can exercise the forces of the law, and yet be guilty of no hardship to the tenants in the Highlands and Islands. Under that Act every tenant possesses fixity of tenure. He may also claim a fair rent, and, under proper conditions, an extension of his holding. If, therefore, we carry out the law, as we hope to do, we, at all events, derive from that Act the satisfaction of knowing that we do not, and cannot, from the nature of things, be guilty of a harsh measure to the tenants of Scotland. There are those who think that, the Irish judicial rents having been fixed when prices were higher, hardship has been done; but that particular hardship cannot arise in this case, because the rents are not yet fixed. The rents will be fixed when prices are at their very lowest. I therefore would appeal to the House, and, above all, to hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite, whose policy we propose to continue, to support us in doing what we can to restore to something like law and order the disturbed districts of the Western Highlands and Islands. I say that partly in the interests of the great principles of law and justice, partly in the interests of the landlords—even a landlord may have justice done him occasionally, but, most of all, in the interests of the unhappy people who live in these districts; for if there be any truth whatever in the principle which has always guided the action of this House, it is undoubtedly true that no society can prosper so long as law and order are utterly disregarded among the people comprised under it.

Dr. R. McDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) (who rose amid cries of "Divide!") said: I shall try to be as short as I can; but I must reply to part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour). I freely acknowledge that the right hon. Gentleman has spoken as I should expect a landlord who is a fair and charitable landlord to speak. I know that, as far as he is concerned, he is one of the good landlords in Scotland. We find no fault with him, personally, at all. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that the crofters live under the best land system we have in this country, or anywhere else. I quite agree with him that the system is good, if it were thoroughly carried out; but what is the good of a land system where a man can only get an acre of land to cultivate? It was pointed out in the last Parliament that it was impossible, no matter how good the Land Law might be in theory, to carry it out entirely in practice, and I have no doubt that the Commissioners will show before long that that is the case. The right hon. Gentleman talked of the ignorance of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) about the Crofters' Question. I differ entirely from him. I know that the hon. Member for Leicester has lived for months among the crofters, and that he has made it his special study to inquire into their condition. I believe that there is not another man, either from the South of Scotland or from England, who knows more about the position of the crofters than the hon. Member for Leicester. Therefore, I do not deem him chargeable with ignorance of the subject. The right hon. Gentleman referred also to the Sutherland evictions; and he attempted to show that what has taken place has been for the good of the people of Sutherland. Let us hope, in all charity, that it was so intended, and that it was upon that ground upon which families who had been comfortably living in their own homes were driven out of the glens which they had occupied for a long series of years down to the sea coast. It is certainly very hard to believe that evictions taking place under such circumstances were for the good of the people who were the victims of them. It must also be borne in mind that evictions have been carried out in other parts of the Highlands where the people were not already living on the sea coast. The object has apparently been to place the land in the hands of large farmers. The land hitherto held in the crofting villages has been taken and the people sent away, and since then the crofting villages have been converted into large farms. That is what has been done in Uist and Lewis, and in many other places. The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out that the crofters of Tiree had the best of land. Now, can any hon. Gentleman in this House who has ever travelled in the Highlands tell, by looking at the land, whether it is occupied by a crofter or a large farmer? As a matter of fact, wherever you see good land it is sure to be in the possession of a large farmer, notwithstanding the fact that the land itself was made by the crofters in former times. Nobody denies that there may have been an influx of wealth into the Highlands since the conversion of large tracts of land into deer forests; but I would point out that this wealth is not spent in the Highlands, nor is it spent in connection with deer forests themselves, except in the payment of the gillies. The owners of the deer forests take their own servants and provisions with them from London; they buy nothing in the locality, and all they spend is what they give to their gillies, who are a portion of the population of whom the people have certainly not too much reason to feel proud. We have heard a great deal about the agitation in the Highlands; but it is not necessary to point out that unless we have the fuel any attempt on the part of agitators in Scotland as well as in Ireland to set fire to it would be useless. Another point referred to by the right hon. Gentleman had connection with the administration of justice. The right hon. Gentleman stated that we have been unable to point out any case in which the Sheriffs or Procurators Fiscal have acted wrongly. One of my hon. Friends was stopped, when he was trying to give an instance of that kind — namely, the case of Sheriff Ivory, Sheriff of Inverness, who acknowledged that, in insisting upon seeing certain telegrams in Portree which he had no right to see, he had been guilty of an offence for which he might have received two years' imprisonment. The only excuse of the Sheriff was that he did not know he was doing wrong. That is one instance; but there are others which might be enumerated. The right hon. Gentleman spoke about the difficulty the crofters have in carrying on agricultural operations. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman of a speech which he himself made upon the Crofters' Bill in the last Parliament. At that time he pointed out the cruelty of offering the crofters land without supplying them with the means of stocking it. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman says "Hear, hear!" Now, I carefully listened to the speech he delivered tonight, in order to see if he intended to carry out the proposal which he was so indignant with the former Government for not having carried out; but I failed to hear any promise whatever on the part of the right hon. Gentleman of assisting the crofters in stocking their crofts. I have no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman would willingly do something in that direction; but there are other reasons which may influence his Colleagues in declining to support him. It has been suggested on the other side of the House that it would not be a bad thing to make loans to the Island fishermen. We have been told, in reference to similar advances which have been made in Ireland, that the Irish small tenants have paid off every halfpenny of the loans granted to them. Although we know very well that the landlords have not repaid their loans, the small tenantry of Ireland have. Then, what is there to prevent the Government from granting loans to the people of the Highlands and Islands for the purpose of obtaining boats and nets and other implements, to enable them to carry on the fishing industry? Surely that would be a far better way of spending the public money than throwing it into the sands of Egypt or the swamps of Burmah. It would be very right and proper to give loans of money to these people, and I do not think the right hon. Gentleman really meant what he said when he contended that it would be wrong to give such loans. I have no doubt that he meant grants, which is a different thing altogether. It is said that a great deal of ignorance and sentiment is mixed up with this question of the crofters. Still, talk as you like about putting down the crofters, every man of common sense in this House must know that the crofter agitation will never be allayed until these people get justice. The Government must bear in mind that they have a Celtic population to deal with. The Celts of Ireland, Wales, and Cornwall will never tamely submit to be deprived of their rights by the landlords. No doubt, the land of the Saxon has been taken away without a word of remonstrance on his part; but it is very different with the Celt. His idea of the tenure of land is the reverse of that of the Saxon, and when the Celt has got his way you may depend upon it that the Saxon also will begin to see that he has been robbed, and will stand it no longer. We have heard a great deal about rack rents in Ireland; but I have always said in this House that there has been very little rack-renting in the Highlands. Out of the four gentlemen mentioned in the Report of the Crofters' Commission as having rack-rented their tenants, two of them—Major Fraser and the Duke of Argyll—have had gun-boats sent to protect their estates. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland puts himself in front of the Commission, and declines to accept as accurate the evidence supplied in their Report. He intimates that he knows better; nevertheless, I think that those who have been over the ground ought to be the best judges of what is right and what is wrong. We are told that the Highlands are over-populated, and that over-congestion is the disease from which the people are suffering. It is proposed, in order to remedy the evil, that the people should be sent out of the country—a remedy which has already been tried in Ireland to the extent of deporting one-third of the population. But in the case of Scotland I maintain that there is no congestion of the population at all. On the contrary, vast tracts of land, suitable for cultivation, have been converted into deer forests, employing only a few gillies upon thousands of acres of land. There can be no congestion of population where such a state of things prevails; and I, for one, refuse to advise the Highlanders to go to a foreign country while there are such vast tracts of land in the Highlands which they can occupy. I know the attachment of these people to their country, and what a terror it is to them to conceive the idea of going away. No doubt, it may be true with regard to the young—as was stated of Scotchmen in olden times—that when they go to England they never take a return ticket; but the older people have no desire to leave the country of their own will so long as there are thousands of acres of good land which have been converted into deer forests ready to receive them. The proper way of dealing with this so-called over-population is to open out these vast tracts of land, and place the people upon them. We shall never be able to deal with the congestion of population except by extending the occupation of the land; and when that is done all the difficulties which now exist will speedily disappear. We have been told that the people of the Highlands are determined not to pay their just debts, either to the landlords or anybody else. Can the right hon. Gentleman prove to this House that these people have got the money to pay their debts? [*Cries of* "Yes!"] It is very easy to say "Yes." I wish it were true; and I am certainly not of the opinion which the right hon. Gentleman has expressed. The right hon. Gentleman, I know, has an intimate acquaintance with the crofters; but I quite disagree with him in thinking that they have money which they decline to part with. I know that they have not got the money, and that they cannot pay their rents. How can a man with a croft of £2 10*s*. or £3 a-year pay his rent, when the fishing, which is the only source from which he procures the money, has altogether failed, as it has this year, and when the crofter has a family of half-a-dozen to provide for? How can a man in such circumstances procure the money to pay his rent? I contend that the system is altogether wrong, and that we should do our best to put it right. The hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Baumann) has spoken of the agitation which has been going on in the Highlands. I believe the hon. Gentleman went down to my constituency two years ago; but I had not the pleasure of meeting him. He made a strong speech in support of the Tory candidate; but it was of so unsatisfactory a nature that he was requested not to address the electors again. There is another point to which I desire to call attention. We have heard, over and over again in this House, a great deal stated in reference to the money spent by the landlords on their estates; but I would ask if that money has been spent in improving the crofters' holdings? Nothing of the sort; for that is a thing which is not known in the Highlands. The Duke of Sutherland is said to have done a great deal for the improvement of his estates. No doubt, the Duke of Sutherland has expended considerable sums in improving his estate as a commercial speculation; but he has done it for the large farmers, and not for the crofters. I do not deny that the money may have been spent; but it has been spent in building castles, and in laying down beautiful gardens. So far as the Island of Lewis is concerned, the speculation entered into there was of a most stupid character, and the money was, in reality, thrown away into the moss. [*Cries of* "No!"] I know the fact better than anyone in the House, and I could point out places where hundreds of thousands of pounds have been expended upon improvements which may never come to anything, because the people who attempted to carry them out knew nothing of the land with which they were dealing. We have heard a great deal about the money spent by the landlords on their estates; but we have heard very little of the money spent for the use and benefit of the landlords themselves. Such a thing as spending money upon the crofters is never known, although very large sums have been ill-spent on the landlords themselves. [*Cries of* "No!"] We have been told by *The Scotsman* and other newspapers what has been done by Lady Matheson in the way of breaking down large farms in Lewis, and giving them to the crofters, and it is said that the same thing is going on in Skye at this day. And why? Because the landlords cannot get anybody to take large farms, and they are, therefore, breaking them up for their own benefit. It is very easy to let a small farm when it is impossible to find a tenant for a large one. There are one or two other facts which I should like to place before the House. In the first place, I wish to refer to an eviction which occurred last week. It is a case in which a Procurator Fiscal was the agent of the landlord and the evictor. There was a disturbance, and the Procurator Fiscal charged the tenant with having deforced him while acting as the landlord's agent. In that case, the Procurator Fiscal had a force of police at his own disposal for carrying out his own evictions. The case occurred at Dornach, on Lady Matheson's estate, and the Sheriff was Mr. Fraser. There have been some similar instances. I will take the case of a gentleman who assumes to be the head of the Mackenzies. A short time ago he evicted a man named Roderick Macrae, who had six acres of croft. Now, every inch of that croft was taken out of the barren land and moss, either by Macrae, or by his father before him. He had built a house upon it, which cost £60. Owing to bad times he had fallen a little into arrear with the landlord, and therefore he was evicted; and instead of receiving the value of the house which he had built for himself the house itself was pulled down, and the man is now living on the roadside with his wife and six children. I only received this information to-day, and if I have been misinformed I shall be happy to apologize to the House later on. There is only one more point I wish to refer to, and that is a case in which the present Lord Lieutenant of Inverness-shire—Lord Lovat—is concerned. The House will be aware that every leaseholder who allows his lease to expire, and does not take out a new lease, becomes a crofter. Lord Lovat, desiring to evict the crofters, has sent out a circular through his agent to the following effect:—

> "I am instructed by Lord Lovat, in consideration of the present circumstances (that is, the Crofters' Commission coming round) to offer to alter the terms of your lease, and to reduce your rent from so many pounds to so many pounds for five years, commencing Whitsuntide last. Please acknowledge receipt."

Now, is Lord Lovat dealing fairly with these people? He knows that they are about to come under the Commission, and why not allow the Commissioners to sift the matter for themselves? On

Lord Lovat's estate in Inverness-shire the tenant has to contribute towards the schools, and to pay the salary of the schoolmaster. He is also required to pay a penny per pound above his rent for statutory assessment, or to give two days' service once a-year of his men, servants, horses, and carts, to assist in draining, repairing, and cleansing out streams—in which, of course, the landlords fish; to assist, further, in erecting embankments thereon, failing which —bear in mind this is all done for the improvement of the landlord's estate for nothing — failing this, the proprietor may employ other labourers with horses and carts, and charge the expense to the tenants along with the next year's rent. His Lordship has issued another estate regulation, in which he reserves to himself the whole game of every kind—rabbits, deer, wild fowls, and the fish in the rivers and burns within his property, with right of access thereto, with power and liberty to himself and others having permission to hunt, fish, and sport thereon, without being liable for any claim for damages or compensation, whether occasioned by game, rabbits, or otherwise. At the end of this regulation there is a provision that the terms contained in the regulation are to be binding, notwithstanding any modification or alteration which may hereafter take place in the existing law. It is a matter of indifference to Lord Lovat and other landlords what laws may be made by this House. They make laws for themselves, and they desire to do what they like. I must apologize to the House for the length at which I have detained it. There is a great deal more which I might say; but I have no desire to keep hon. Members longer. There is, however, one point with reference to the law of the Highlands which I think I ought to mention. The Amendment points out that in the administration of the law the people of the Highlands have no confidence. Let me give an example to show what occurred in the Island of Skye. The only lawyer there who has dared to take the part of the tenants, the only man in whom the people had the slightest confidence, has just been dismissed by the present Lord Advocate from the office of Sheriff Clerk Depute. The Predecessor of the right hon. and learned Gentleman had the case four times before him; but he did not see his way to dismissing this gentleman. As soon, however, as the present Lord Advocate came into Office a private inquiry was held, and this gentleman, who had held office in Skye for 19 years, was dismissed without any rhyme or reason, and he has not been told yet what his crime is. How can the people have the slightest confidence in the administration of the law under such circumstances as these, when gentlemen are dismissed from the positions they have occupied for years without being informed why? I know that there are certain charges which are supposed to have been made against this gentleman; but the least that ought to have been done was to let him know what the charges were, so that he might have been able to defend himself. He was, however, told nothing of the sort; and now the people of Skye, instead of going to the nearest lawyer to conduct their cases when they conceive that they are treated with injustice, have now to go all the way to Inverness. Gentlemen of the Legal Profession who reside nearer Skye are afraid of losing their practice or promotion and future prospects if they take up the cause of these unfortunate people; and the result is that if they want legal advice they have to go at least 100 miles to obtain it.

Mr. A. SUTHERLAND (Sutherlandshire): I do not intend to trespass very long upon the time of the House upon this occasion, and I will only ask for the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. Probably I should not have addressed the House at all if it had not been for the speech which has been delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour). I had expected to have heard some statement from that right hon. Gentleman that would have allayed the fears which are undoubtedly felt throughout the Highlands of Scotland that the law will not be administered in a manner satisfactory to the people, and that he would have assured them that the scales will be held evenly between landlord and tenant. But I regret very much to say that the tone of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman dispelled any such hope that I may have entertained. I could have wished that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate for Scotland had had charge of the Ministerial statement, because I consider that that right hon. and learned Gentleman's popularity in Scotland—I hope he will pardon me for mentioning it, but it is the fact all the same, for the right hon. and learned Gentleman is extremely popular in Scotland—I had hoped that if he could have spoken on behalf of the Government the irritation which is bound to be felt in consequence of the tone of the speech of the Secretary for Scotland would have been avoided. I am, Sir, to all intents and purposes, a crofter myself, and I think I ought to know something about the people I belong to. Nevertheless, I have come now to this House to learn, for the first time, that the crofters of Scotland are really different from what I have known them to be all my life. I have heard statements to-night in regard to the people I belong to which have very much astonished me, although I have been very intimately acquainted with them all the days of my life. As to the remarks which were made by the hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Baumann), I believe that if the Highlands suffer more from one thing than another it is in consequence of the opinions of Gentlemen like the hon. Member, who go to the Highlands for the first time in their lives, and after a sojourn of two or three days think that they know all about the country, and that nobody knows anything about it except themselves. I have no objection in the world to the hon. Gentleman having an opinion about the Highlands; but if he will return to Scotland several times I think he will learn a great deal more about the Highlands than he appears to know at present.

MR. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham): May I say, in my own self-defence, that I was born in Scotland.

MR. A. SUTHERLAND: I am glad to find that the hon. Gentleman has the honour of being a Scotchman; but I cannot admit that his account of the condition of the Highlands was at all an accurate one. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland found fault with what fell from the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton), and characterized the source of the information of the hon. Member as gossip. Let me point out to the right hon. Gentleman that a great deal of what he himself has brought forward here to-day to prove that there has been lawlessness in Scotland is, in my estimation, the merest gossip. He stated, with regard to the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House, that crime is rampant there. I should be glad to learn the right hon. Gentleman's authority for making that statement. I have not been so long away from that county that I should not have heard if any such state of crime existed in it. But I will tell the House what I do know. Shortly before I left Sutherlandshire, I saw upon the roadside two women living in a hut which they had erected, after having been evicted from a house which their father had put up, without a single penny of expense to the landlord. I presume that the right hon. Gentleman knows something about the history of Sutherlandshire. If he had not referred to that county I should not have detained the House by introducing the matter. There are, however, in the history of that unfortunate county circumstances which it would be well that we should—all friends of the landlords especially—try to bury in oblivion. The right hon. Gentleman told us that the Sutherland clearances have been undertaken from benevolent motives. I am ready to admit that that is quite possible; but the mistake which was made was this—that the people themselves were never consulted, and they, at least, ought to know something about what was for their own advantage. There are many points of view from which the Sutherland clearances may be regarded. The right hon. Gentleman said that it is necessary to take the state of the Highlands as it is at present. The right hon. Gentleman has forgotten that the present condition of Scotland arises directly out of what took place 80 years ago, and a provision in the Crofters' Act, with which I believe the right hon. Gentleman himself had as much to do as anybody, provides that crofting parishes are to be defined according to what the state of things was 80 years ago. That directly brings home to us the fact that all the trouble already existing in the Highlands arises from the policy which has been pursued there during the last 100 years. If the state of the Highlands is unsatisfactory as this Amendment declares, and as everyone who has any knowledge of the Highlands will be ready to admit—if that be so, and we have every reason to believe that it is so, then the whole of the blame attaches to the landlords of the Highlands, because they have been practically omnipotent there for the last 100 years. Everything that exists there to-day is directly attributable to their action. I am not going to follow the right hon. Gentleman into the question of the agitation in the Highlands. That is entirely unnecessary, and I scorn to follow him into that field. The claim of the Highland people rests upon something higher than that. What we want in the Highlands is leave to live and prosper in our own land, and to have, at least, equal rights with sheep and red-deer. To say that the question in the Highlands is a question of population is to show, in my estimation at least, very little knowledge of the subject. There has been a great emigration from the Highlands, as the right hon. Gentleman knows very well. But has that benefited the people left behind? Not in the slightest. The difficulty which at present arises is that there is a certain amount of population—none too much for the land—that the land is there, and that the land is wasted. There is the land, and there are the people; let us bring the two together. But at present the land is lying out of cultivation; and how can it be held that the land is over-populated, when we see the large tracts of land which are devoted to deer forests? Practical foresters tell me it is notorious that deer will not live in some places where sheep could live; they require better land. I know of large forests where sheep have been reared within my own memory, and where human beings had lived before, but which have now been turned into deer forests. I simply wish to say that I am as anxious as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland that lawlessness should not exist in the Highlands. Notwithstanding all that, the right hon. Gentleman has said tonight, in accusing the Highlanders of lawlessness, that they have not been lawless hitherto, and I am anxious that they should be kept in a law-abiding condition; and the only way to do that is to bring the law into some sort of accord with the sentiment of the people. The present is a golden opportunity for the Conservative Party to distinguish itself by its treatment of this question; because it is the fact, Sir, that the Highlands have hitherto owed nothing to the Liberals. It is also a fact that the Highland people have always borne such a good character that they can appeal to all sections of this House. We can appeal to the Conservatives for support to the Amendment, because they have been no worse, as far as the Highlands are concerned, than the Whig Party — the Highlanders have been treated better by the Conservatives than by the Whig Party. That is one reason why I was sorry for the tone in which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland spoke. They can appeal also to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain) and his Party in this House, because the right hon. Gentleman went to the Highlands a year ago, and delivered a speech at Inverness which delighted the hearts of all Highlanders. We, therefore, claim the support to this Amendment of the followers of the right hon. Gentleman. It is unnecessary to appeal to our Irish Friends. The similarity of the condition of affairs in Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland has created a lasting sympathy between the two peoples. You will find that the people in the Highlands have not the slightest difficulty in understanding the Irish Question, simply because the condition of the people in Ireland is exactly the same as that of the people in the Highlands. I can claim also the support of the Radical Members for this Amendment, because the question to be solved in the Highlands is identical with the question which the democracy of England have so much at heart; and I therefore appeal to all branches of the democracy throughout the country with the most perfect confidence. In accordance with the intimation which I conveyed at the opening of my remarks, I will not detain the House further than to say that it is because we want to have law and order preserved in the Highlands that we make this appeal to Her Majesty's Government to hold out some hope to the people of the Highlands that justice will be administered with some regard to the existing state of matters there. It is admitted that we have Land Laws there which are notoriously in favour of one class. That is bad enough in all conscience. The task of reforming these laws is, in itself, a sufficient task for any body of men to have in hand at one time; and we do not want to be embarrassed, in the legal and Constitutional agitation we are carrying on, by having the administration of the law against us at the same time. It is handicapping us far too much. I therefore appeal to Her Majesty's Government that they should give some consideration to the wishes of the Highland people in regard to this matter. But if, instead of doing that, the Government mean to throw down the gauntlet to the people of the Highlands in the way the right hon. Gentleman has done this evening, then all we can say, who have any knowledge of the Highlands, is that we wash our hands of all responsibility. I had hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would have assisted us in maintaining law and order in the Highlands, and treat us in a more charitable spirit than he has adopted. By so doing he would have inspired the people of the Highlands with hope; and they would have waited patiently, in the meantime, for the legal and Constitutional redress of their grievances through the medium of this House.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR (Clackmannan, &c.): I do not propose to stand very long between the House and a division; but, having had a chief part in carrying the Crofters' Bill through this House in the last Parliament, and reference having been made to certain matters with respect to which I may, in some sense, be said to have been officially responsible, I do not think it is right that I should vote upon this Amendment without shortly stating the course which I propose to take. I am, Sir, unable to support the Amendment in either of its branches. Although not the first in order of precedence in the Amendment itself, one of the paragraphs of the Amendment refers to the Crofters' Act of last Session. This House is asked to affirm, in answer to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne—

> "That the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters' Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the formation of new holdings where they are urgently required."

In short, the House is asked by the Amendment to condemn, in answer to the Speech from the Throne, an Act of Parliament which is hardly two or three months old, which is only now being put into operation, and in regard to which, of course, we have not yet had time for obtaining experience. I say that it would require some very strong and very clear evidence—for evidence derived from experience there can be none, and all that could be applied would be in the nature of argument—to justify an appeal from the last Parliament to the present in favour of an amendment of the Act. Now, Sir, whatever position the House may be disposed to take in amending an Act of Parliament founded upon experience, and which has proved to be defective, I am quite sure that it will be always ready to lend an ear to anyone who would be able to point out any defects in an Act of Parliament; but it would be somewhat rash and inexpedient to take that step in respect of an Act which was only placed upon the Statute Book the other day. The Commissioners are now only starting on the performance of their duties; they have been designating the areas which are crofter parishes within the Act; they are laying down rules and regulations, and they are zealously setting themselves to work.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): They are going to begin at once.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR: I have no doubt that is so; and yet that is the position in which we are asked to affirm the proposition that the Crofters' Act has failed to remedy the grievances of which the crofters and cottars complain. I do not propose to enter into any examination of the Crofters' Act itself, because I am afraid it was my duty to detain the House, on an occasion now almost memorable, when it became my duty to say a great deal upon many of the lines and clauses contained in it. But I will say this—that that Act, whatever defects are contained in it in the judgment of some persons—and I do not suppose that anyone is prepared to maintain that it is perfect—is a larger measure in favour of the occupying cultivators of the soil than has ever been passed by the British Parliament, or, as far as I know, of any other country. It not only gives fixity, in the sense of perpetuity of tenure, on certain reasonable conditions being fulfilled; but it also gives the right to have a fair rent fixed by an impartial tribunal, together with a scale of compensation for improvements of much greater liberality and much greater breadth than that which was given either in England or Scotland by the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1882. I only mention this for the information of hon. Members who were not in the last Parliament; but there was one point which was dealt with by the Act which was of a novel character. It made provision, which, as far as I am aware, had never been done in any other measure, for enlarging existing holdings. That was a very large proposal—a very novel, a very important, but in our judgment a sound and a just proposal, looking at the historical conditions of the persons affected; but it required to be made with considerable caution, and to be accompanied by certain safeguards. I am not going to examine now what they are; but I will just say this—that with respect to the matter of deer forests very little respect was shown for deer forests by the Bill, because we provided that deer forests, whether they were under lease or not, might be taken for the purpose of enlarging holdings. We considered that, as a matter of public policy, sport should not be allowed to compete with the use of land which might be turned to account in providing the means of subsistence. Taking that view, we showed no respect for deer forests; but while the Bill was passing through the House the Amendment which has already been read was inserted in the measure. I think that when the matter is fully understood by the House no one will deny that what we had regard to, in proposing or accepting that Amendment, was the general benefit of the inhabitants of the district, and that it was not an unreasonable limitation to impose in what was certainly a novel and an important Bill. I can only say that if the land is so occupied, or the crofters so situated, that there would not be that amount of benefit which we had hoped, and still believe, will be given by the Act, I should be ready to assist in amending it. I am not satisfied, however, that the Act will not confer a very large amount of benefit. But, as I have said, it has not yet been proved by experience; but we believe that it will have the effect of adding very materially to existing crofts, particularly in the way of the restoration of those old pastures, the deprivation of which has been an undoubted hardship to the indigenous inhabitants of the Highlands, and which I believe has produced a great deal of the poverty and dissatisfaction we have had to lament in recent years in those localities. I entirely agree in a great deal that has been said by hon. Members as to the conditions of Highland life, and the necessity of providing the people, in order to make their position comfortable and continuous, with some outlying land as a run for their cattle. We did our best to provide that. Something has been said in regard to the resistance which I felt it my duty to offer to certain Amendments that were proposed at the time the Bill was passing through the House; and it has been alleged that we were rather too stiff in that matter. I may mention, for the information of those who were not then in the House, that the course which was taken with regard to this Bill was not a course which was followed with respect to this Bill only. Something has been said to-night in regard to Home Rule. I am not going to enter into that question, except to say that we have had a modified but satisfactory mode of Home Rule, in reference to Scotch questions, which has been in existence for some years. It has been the custom for the Scotch Members, in conference with the Government, to come to an understanding on all Scotch questions; and effect has invariably been given, not only by the Government, but by the House, to any understanding thus arrived at by the Scotch Members. That course was followed in regard to this Bill, because my right hon. Friend (Sir George Trevelyan), who was then Secretary for Scotland, invited the Scotch Members to meet to consider the Bill, as introduced, along with another Bill. It was a full and very representative meeting which lasted for some hours, and at which the main questions relating to the Bill were discussed. And what was the result? A number of points were considered on that occasion in regard to which the prevalent sense of the meeting was that the Bill might be safely enlarged, and every one of the resolutions adopted at that meeting was given effect to. Every one of the Amendments was placed upon the Paper and incorporated in the Bill. I have desired to say this, because a different idea has been prevalent. I am quite

quite aware that there were very large, very debatable, and very important questions raised and fully discussed during the passing of the Bill through the House; and in regard to these I will say nothing more than that the judgment of the House was taken upon them, and that that judgment is expressed in the Bill. Whatever may be said in regard to the introduction of any further Bill by way of amending the existing Act, it would be both unsafe, and, I may also say, hardly respectful, without having had any experience of the working of the Act, for the House to pronounce a condemnation of the measure in answer to the Speech from the Throne. I do not propose to enter now into the details which have been referred to—because I think they may be more profitably discussed on some future occasion—as to the state of the law in particular localities. Several grievances which we have heard of before have been mentioned, and among others the combination of public offices in the hands of the same individual; also the fact that public officials have also held private positions which might be considered inconsistent with the performance of their public duties. It may be in the recollection of hon. Members who had seats in the last Parliament that the two Governments, of which I had the honour to be a Member, did make an important departure in this matter in regard to the appointment of Procurators Fiscal. They did so for this reason—that, although there may have been no complaint, and very little feeling on the subject, in some localities, yet in others there were many considerations of expediency which pointed to the necessity of having a man of certain position, of experience, and of standing to perform the public duties of Sheriff Clerks and Procurators Fiscal. Even although conflict did not exist, it was felt that if any strained feeling should hereafter arise, it was most desirable and expedient that there should be a complete severance of official and private duties, particularly in regard to one class of duties; and the Government made it their business, when new appointments came to be made, and wherever adequate salary could be given, to make it a condition that the gentleman appointed should restrict himself exclusively to his official public duties. We adopted that course more especially in reference to appointments to the office of Sheriff Clerk and Procurator Fiscal, and I have no doubt that our Successors in Office will agree with us in the general principle we inaugurated, and which we acted upon to the best of our ability. I am quite aware that we did not cover the whole ground; because there have been cases where individuals have held offices which we have had no power to divide. We did, however, make an endeavour, as far as we were able, especially in those counties where unhappily there had been disturbances, to secure that the public officials should have no private interests to serve; and when we left Office I think that, with the exception of one or two cases, we had very nearly completed arrangements for restricting public officers in future to the performance of their official duties. I trust that the present Government will follow our example, and in view of the responsibility which attaches to them that they will see that the official duties are kept separate and distinct wherever it is possible to do so, and by that means not allow even the idea or the feeling to go forth that there is anything objectionable in the way in which justice is administered. Something has been said in the course of the debate in regard to certain particular cases; but as you, Sir, stopped the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) and other hon. Members from entering into these questions, it would not be right in me to follow the same course. But I was surprised to hear the remarks which fell from the hon. Member for Ross-shire (Dr. M'Donald) in reference to the Sheriff of Inverness-shire, whom he accused of having pursued a line of conduct which he has himself absolutely and emphatically denied. An explanation was given in this House at the time, and it is not necessary that I should repeat now what I said then on the matter. If he had been guilty of the conduct imputed to him, he would not only have rendered himself liable to be dismissed from office, but it would have been the duty of the Government to see that such a thing did not occur again. Another matter was referred to by the same hon. Member, in regard to which I also feel it my duty to say a word, because, if I did not, an erroneous impression would be conveyed. The hon. Member referred to a gentleman who some time ago held an official position in the Isle of Skye, and whom, he said, had been dismissed from his official position for practising in his profession. I think I know the gentleman to whom the hon. Member refers. He was the holder of a public office, and the hon. Gentleman has stated that he had been dismissed from that office by the present Lord Advocate, although I had inquired into the charges against him, and had refrained from taking action upon them. That is not quite correct. It was a case which demanded, and which received, the most careful and the most dispassionate consideration; but it had not gone beyond that stage when I left Office in the month of June last. The gentleman in question held a very high character; and he received, as every man is entitled to receive, that benefit of that high character, and of the opinion which was entertained of him by the tenants. I have no doubt that those circumstances were also taken into consideration by the present Government. But there are certain things which may be considered inconsistent with the continuous tenure of a public office; and in the case of the gentleman referred to I have no doubt that the Government arrived at a right and wise decision, and I cannot, with any justice or propriety, say that it was an act of our Successors in which they took any vindictive proceeding against a particular individual, because he had acted as the friend of the tenants against the interests of the landlords. I do not propose to enter into any of the other matters which have been mentioned; but I am satisfied that wherever it has been found necessary to supplement the ordinary force of law by the introduction of extraneous forces, it has always been, and must have been, to those who had to do it, a matter of profound regret. I think it may be said that, on the only occasions on which recourse has been had to such forces, the expeditions themselves had nothing whatever to do either with evictions or the collection of rent. My right hon. Friend the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir William Harcourt) made a speech upon that subject the other day; and he then laid it down, most clearly and distinctly, that the reason why those expeditions were sent out was purely in support of the police in the event of their being overpowered in the execution of the law, and I am glad to say that when they were sent the expeditions were effective, and that nothing like a collision with the people took place. Nothing would have been more unfortunate than any collision of the kind. These poor people of the Western Highlands had, by some means or other, been led into error; but when they saw that the forces of the Crown were there they became disabused of their error. Somehow or other they had received the impression that the police were not a force they were bound to obey; that they were acting without the sanction of the Crown or of the law; but, to their credit be it said, as soon as they found that the police were supported by the majesty of the law, then they ceased to persevere in the courses which had led to the despatch of the expedition against them. I will only, in conclusion, express an earnest hope that every person, whether in this House or out of it, who has any influence with these people, whose welfare we all of us have so much at heart, will, in consideration of the remedial measures upon which some of us, at all events—whether successfully or not I will not undertake to say—have bestowed so much time and care, use their influence with those who may be disaffected to induce them not to break the law. I have considerable knowledge of the feeling in different parts of Scotland, and the effect of some recent occurrences in the Highlands has been rather to alienate sympathy that would otherwise have been extended to these people. No man deplores more than I do that there should be any malpractices which should lead to the alienation of sympathy from a people who have been formerly free from all sorts of agrarian crime, and who even now are singularly free from all ordinary crime. But, having regard to what I have already said, I submit that there is no sufficient reason for affirming the propositions of the Amendment; but that does not imply any want of sympathy with the people to whom it relates.

Mr. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.) (who rose amid loud calls for a division) said: I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House for many minutes, and I would advise hon. Members on the other side to take notice that if they wish to shorten the debate they will act wisely in giving me a courteous hearing, rather than by trying to shout me down. I did not intend to take any part in the debate at so late an hour; but, having listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour), I think the language which he applied to some of my Colleagues, and the tone in which he spoke, calls for a few words of remonstrance. It is all very well for the right hon. Gentleman, from the lofty position he appears to occupy, in his own estimation, to look down with lordly contempt upon my Colleagues for their want of information as to the affairs of Scotland. But having, as the right hon. Gentleman proposes to have, the interests of Scotland at heart, he ought rather to welcome the interest we manifest in Scotch affairs than attempt to decry it. I may say, on behalf of my countrymen, that we feel a very deep interest in Scottish affairs, for "a fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind." We feel that as Irishmen our sympathies ought to be given to the people of a country who are allied to us in race, in language, and especially in the treatment they have received at the hands of exterminating landlords, in the long-suffering patience with which they have endured it, and in the fact that they would have been allowed to suffer in silence if they had not thought fit to attract the attention of their Rulers by taking active measures to bring their grievances prominently forward. They are, further, like the people of Ireland in finding that the remedy which has been applied to their grievances is altogether an insufficient one. There is another reason, Sir, why I take a special interest in this Crofter Question, and it is this. In the Carlingford district of the constituency which I have the honour to represent there are a number of people who are similarly treated to the crofters of Scotland, seeing that they occupy barren and sterile land, and find it necessary to eke out a livelihood by fishing, and other avocations of that kind. *Apropos* of this, I may mention—what I had no opportunity of mentioning in the course of the debate on the affairs of Ireland—that in this district there are no less than 150 people who are threatened with eviction, because they are one year in arrear with their rent. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland has expressed an opinion that the crofters of Scotland are in a better position than the tenantry of any other country. In connection with that assertion I should like to say that at the time the Crofters' Bill was about to pass the third reading I received a communication from the Highland Society of Liverpool, consisting of people very closely connected with the crofters, assuring me, in the strongest terms, that if the Bill were passed it would not meet the difficulties of the case. Since then I have had an opportunity of consulting Highlanders of considerable intelligence, and they have fully endorsed what was said by the Highland Society of Liverpool. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of foresting, and he said that the formation of deer forests in Scotland had conferred benefits upon the Highlanders. That is another matter upon which very considerable difference of opinion prevails. All the Scotchmen I have met with tell me that they look upon the deer forests in the Highlands as an unmixed evil. Upon this subject I am reminded of one of the arguments advanced by the Pilgrim Fathers when they were appropriating the land of the red men in America—namely, that it was not fair or right that large districts should be left for a few deer to range over, when they might be made a corn-producing country, capable of feeding the toiling millions in Europe. Before I leave the subject I would remind the right hon. Gentleman and the House that deer cannot live upon rocks any more than the people. I was much struck with a statement made by the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton), that he had seen large tracts of arable land set apart for the use of game during the winter. A very short time ago I saw a gamekeeper engaged in raising pheasants close by a very large cornfield. I saw young pheasants running in and out of the field, and I ventured to call the keeper's attention to the fact that the corn would not be worth much. "Oh!" he said, "if the corn goes we shall have the game." I therefore took it for granted that in the eyes, not only of the gamekeeper, but of those who employed him, arable ground is of no consequence in the Highlands, so long as the game is there. The right hon. Gentleman said that it was useless to go back to history, and to rake up the wrongs which have been perpetrated upon these people, and the robberies that have been effected. I have no doubt that there are certain persons who have a strong dislike to go back to the past, and particularly those who are now enjoying the spoil. When the right hon. Gentleman speaks of the doctrine of spoliation having been put forward by the Land League and the National League of Ireland, I would ask him to bear in mind the part which has been played in the matter of property by the predecessors of those who now claim all right and title to the land. The right hon. Gentleman spoke about the love which he bears to the Highlander; but when I view the clearances which have been effected in the Highlands, and the fact that he pleads an excuse for them, I am reminded of Mokanna's love for mankind. I was present during the crofters' debate in the last Parliament, and I listened with great attention to the speeches which were then made. I was forcibly struck with the fact that both the right hon. Gentleman and the then Treasury Bench seemed to agree with one another very well, when it came to a matter of whittling down the concessions granted to the crofters by the original Bill. The right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just addressed the House from the Front Opposition Bench (Mr. J. B. Balfour) has given ample proof that things have not changed since in this particular. The hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Baumann), in the course of his remarks to-night, in speaking about property in land, alluded to it as if the whole of the land in a certain portion of the Highlands belonged to the Duke of Argyll. I invariably notice that when hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House talk about property in land it is always about the landlords' property that they speak. They never seem to take into account that the tenant has any property at all. They seem to forget the fact that the tenants have got property in the land. The people of the Highlands of Scotland, as well as of Ireland, have been and are being constantly robbed of the fruit of their labour, and of their interest in the land. According to the Brehon law, which, I take it, prevailed at one time in the Highlands of Scotland, as it did in Ireland and in this country, the land did not belong to a few aristocrats, but to the people. Even according to the feudal system that was introduced into this country by the Normans, the land was not given to the aristocracy to become their own property; but the aristocrats simply possessed a life interest in the land, and they were required to discharge very distinct and very important military services as a condition of their holding the land. I should like to know what would have become of them if they had refused to fulfil the conditions? Even in our own day, according to the law of the land, there are many of the great estates in the country in which the so-called owners have simply a life interest, the land being entailed on the nearest male heir. Now, Sir, I do not intend to trespass any further upon the time and the attention of the House—["Hear, hear!"]—but if anything could induce me to do so it would be the manifestations of impatience which have been made by our courteous Friends on the Ministerial side of the House. It is just possible, Sir, that they object to my unpractised style; but I may remind them of a story which is told of Von Moltke, when his artillerymen were bombarding Paris. There was, I believe, if I may venture to tell the story—there was a message sent to him, informing him that some of his shells had struck some of the public hospitals in the city, and he very humanely replied that he intended to alter the position of his batteries, and that with the change of position and a little more practice upon the part of his artillerymen these things would not occur. I hope, Sir, that with a little more practice I shall not weary hon. Gentlemen. As to the ownership of the land, perhaps I may be allowed to quote a great English authority—Mr. Mill. Mr. Mill writes—

> "The land of any country belongs to the people of that country. The individuals called landowners have no right, in morality and justice, to anything but the rent or compensation for its saleable value."

And further on, in speaking about the "peculiar burthens" which landlords sometimes complain of, he says—

> "What has been epigrammatically said on 'peculiar burthens' is literally true when applied to them—that the greatest 'burthen on land' is the landlords. Returning nothing to the soil, they consume its whole produce, minus the pittance strictly necessary to keep the inhabitants from dying of famine; and when they have any purpose of improvement, the preparatory step usually consists in not leaving

them even this pittance, but turning out the people to beggary, if not to starvation. When landed property has placed itself on this footing it ceases to be defensible, and the time has come for making some new arrangement of the matter. When the sacredness of property is talked of, it should always be remembered that any such sacredness does not belong in the same degree to landed property. No man made the land. It is the original inheritance of the whole species. Its appropriation is a question of general expediency. When private property in land is not expedient it is unjust."

And another great English authority—Herbert Spencer—said, in *Social Statics*—

"Equity does not permit property in land. For if one portion of the earth's surface may justly become the possession of an individual, held for his sole use and benefit as a thing to which he has an exclusive right, then other portions of its surface may be so held, and our planet may thus lapse into private hands. It follows that if the landowners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not landowners have no right at all to its surface. Hence such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by permission of the landlords they can have no room for the soles of their feet—nay, these landless men may be equitably expelled from the earth altogether."

These are authorities which may be fairly weighed against the hon. Gentleman with regard to the exclusive ownership of land claimed by him for landlords. In conclusion, I beg to say I have read the Amendment of my hon. Friend (Dr. Clark) with very great attention; and I beg to say that I, as an Irishman, as one who feels the deepest sympathy with the people of the Highlands of Scotland, endorse every word of it, and am prepared to give it my hearty support.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.): Mr. Speaker—Sir, I will just draw the attention of the House for one moment to that portion of the Amendment which states "that the administration of the law does not possess the confidence of the people." One of the reasons why the law does not possess the confidence of the people is, in my opinion, that the law comes to the Scottish people in a foreign garb. Scotch laws are not made by Scotchmen for their own benefit; but they are made in an Assembly in which Englishmen, who have very little interest, perhaps, in Scotland, outvote the Scottish Representatives. Until the Scottish people demand and obtain the resuscitation of their own Parliament in the Register House, Edinburgh, this part of the Amendment—"the administration of the law does not possess the confidence of the people"—will hold good. We were told by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) that these crofters, these men who are the descendants of those who have carried your bayonets throughout the world victoriously, are robbers. ["Oh, oh!"] We were told that very distinctly. It is a nice state of affairs when, in this House, a portion of the people in Her Majesty's Dominions, not very far away, are told that they are altogether dishonest. I cannot for the life of me see why the existence of the Scottish people should not go before law and order. The existence of the people should always go before law and order. Law and order were only broken when the laws are found to be antagonistic to the rights, liberties, and sentiments of the people. It is because British law, or even the Norman law, so well referred to by my hon. Friend (Mr. Nolan)——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is trifling with the House. I must ask the hon. Member to confine his remarks strictly to the Amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLANE: With reference to that portion of the Amendment to which I drew attention a few moments ago—namely, "that the administration of the law does not possess the confidence of the people," I believe that until the Scottish people make laws for themselves in Edinburgh there will always be this non-confidence.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Notwithstanding the impatience of hon. Gentlemen opposite, I am very anxious to make some observations on this most important Amendment for a reason which ought to be satisfactory to every Member of this House, and that is that I take a very great interest in the subject-matter of the Amendment. I have listened with considerable attention to the course of the debate this evening; and the case which has been made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark) in moving his Amendment has not, I think, been met by any arguments which have been put forward from the other side of the House. One portion of this Amendment refers in specific terms to the lamentable fact—

"That the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters' Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings and the formation of new holdings where they are urgently required."

Sir, those Members who had the privilege of sitting in this House in the previous Parliament can recollect most distinctly how the Scotch Crofter Members, dealing with the Crofters' Bill, brought forward night after night Amendments calculated to improve the Bill by making it more workable and suitable to the condition of their people. Night after night the Irish Members, and the Radical Members also, divided with the Scotch Crofter Members, in order to make the Bill a real Bill, such a Bill as would benefit the people it was intended to benefit. But, Sir, Amendment after Amendment was brought forward, only to be out-voted by English Members who knew nothing of the question, and whose ignorance of the question was only equalled by their utter want of sympathy with the intentions of those who brought forward the measure. Sir, it will be within your recollection that many of the Lords' Amendments to the Crofters' Bill were opposed by the hon. Members for Kirkcaldy, Aberdeen, and Wick, and that those hon. Gentlemen distinctly refused to take any responsibility for the measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is going into the Crofters' Act. He has said nothing yet pertinent to the Amendment.

MR. FLYNN: I was simply referring, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Amendment recites that the most pressing grievance of the crofters has not been remedied by the Crofters' Act; but, Sir, with reference to the speeches which have been made from the Government Benches against this Amendment, I only wish to make a few observations. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland has declared in unmistakable terms—[*Interruption*]—he has in very clear terms—[*Cries of* "Order, order!"] Mr. Speaker, I can assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that I intend to make a few observations upon this most important Amendment, and if any interruption of this kind——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman will pursue his remarks.

MR. FLYNN: I am endeavouring to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is nearly approaching the conduct of a previous hon. Member who, I said, was trifling with the House, and I must caution him to speak with more relevancy to the Amendment.

MR. FLYNN: The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland has charged, in effect, that the disturbances in the Highlands of Scotland are not due so much to the depressed condition of the people, are not due so much to rack-renting, or to the grievances of which the crofters complain, but is due to the fact that agitators have got amongst them, and that demoralizing and dishonest doctrines have been spoken. In effect, the right hon. Gentleman has charged a large portion of the population of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland with dishonesty.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never made any such charge.

MR. FLYNN: It will be within the recollection of the House that the right hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that not only were rents not being paid in these places, but that the debts contracted with ordinary creditors were not being paid. In pursuing the matter he said that the sore spreads. If that is not making a charge of dishonesty in effect, I fail to understand what the language means. But, Sir, if the people of the Highlands do not feel aggrieved; if there is no rack-renting and unfair evictions; if the conditions of life are not harsh and wretched in the extreme, how can it be possible that agitators going amongst them can produce the disorders to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred? Sir, you cannot have smoke without fire; you cannot have these disorders without there being grave and deep causes for their existence. Sir, it is a sad commentary on the civilization of the present day; it is a sad commentary on the condition of things that in a country which has found so many brave men to fight for the maintenance of the honour and glory of the British Empire——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must call the attention of the House to the irrelevancy and tedious repetition of the hon. Member, and ask him to resume his seat.

MR. FLYNN remained standing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I directed the hon. Gentleman to resume his seat.

Mr. FLYNN resumed his seat.

MR. CONWAY (Leitrim, N.): Under ordinary conditions, Sir, I should have been content to have given a silent vote; but after listening to the speech of the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) I certainly do think I am within my right in rising to protest against the language he used with reference to Ireland by adopting a system of argument by analogy. He over and over again levelled his shafts at Ireland and left the main question. Sir, the House is in possession of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, and I am within my right in commenting upon it; and with the object of making my comments as brief as possible I took a few notes. First of all, the right hon. Gentleman laid down the dictum that no one in this House had a right to speak on Scottish questions, except those who have connection with Scotland. If that argument is to hold good, I wonder what right we had last night to talk about Burmah; and, Sir, to come nearer home, I wonder how many Members on the opposite side of the House would have any right to speak about Ireland?

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Gentleman to speak pertinently to the Amendment.

MR. CONWAY: Sir, I am trying to reply to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman will not dispute my ruling.

MR. CONWAY: I have no wish at all, Sir, to run counter to your ruling; but, inasmuch as the speech of the right hon. Gentleman is in the possession of the House, I thought I was within my right in commenting upon that speech. [MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!] With regard to the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman had to shift his responsibility in discussing that Amendment by remarking that the main course adopted by us was to abuse the landlord system. I think the system itself affords sufficient opportunity for hon. Gentlemen to abuse it. The system, as enunciated by the right hon. Gentleman, was supported by instancing a few cases of good landlords. Sir, in the time of the Slave Trade there was an endeavour to uphold slavery by instancing the cases of a few good slave owners. The slave system was rotten, and fell to the ground; the landlord system is rotten, and will inevitably fall to the ground. The Scotch Members, in this Amendment, state that they object to the Crofters' Act because the condition of the crofters is unsatisfactory. I am in thorough sympathy with that statement of the Scotch Members, and will vote for this Amendment. It is also stated in the Amendment that the Scotch crofters have no confidence in the administration of the law; and after reading in to-day's paper a speech of Lord M'Laren I am not surprised at this want of confidence. Speaking at Inverary, Lord M'Laren said the crofters had been "deluded by agitators." Oh, but the delusion has been found to be a sad reality, a sad reality of crofter life, and I believe the speech of the Secretary for Scotland will stimulate such a feeling in Scotland that at the next Election it will not be found that 12 Gentlemen have been returned to swell the Tory ranks. This noble and learned Lord went on to state "that the landlords would be protected"—yes, at the expense of the tenants—and he held out the hope that there would soon be a gunboat placed at the service of the authorities in Scotland for the purpose of intimidating the people. When these speeches were made, when they were reported so recently as to-day, this Amendment of the Scotch Members is very timely; and those who sympathize with the Amendment will, by going into the Lobby, show Lord M'Laren and those who think with him that there is in a part of the House the determination that justice shall be conceded to these crofters.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with reference to the Amendment before the House. I wish to say that if the condition of the people in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is so unsatisfactory as it has been represented it is the duty of the House to find a remedy. If the administration of the law does not possess the confidence of the people there must be some cause. Have we Irish Members, who have seen our own countrymen oppressed by landlordism, not the right on this occasion to raise our voices on behalf of the poor Scotch crofters who have been driven from the Lowlands into the mountain caves?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is also trifling with the House. I must ask him to speak more relevantly to the Amendment.

Mr. O'Hanlon resumed his seat.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 121; Noes 203: Majority 82.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Asquith, H. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Borlase, W. C.
Bright, Jacob
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Burt, T.
Cameron, J. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Chamberlain, R.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Colman, J. J.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly, L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Crawford, D.
Crilly, D.
Dillon, J.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. G.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gill, T. P.
Gourley, E. T.
Gray, E. D.
Harrington, E.
Harris, M.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Hunter, W. A.
Illingworth, A.
Jacoby, J. A.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Leamy, E.
Lewis, T. P.
M'Arthur, W. A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, Dr. R.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Mason, S.
Molloy, B. C.
Morgan, O. V.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Doherty, J. E.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Parnell, C. S.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Power, P. J.
Priestley, B.
Provand, A. D.
Reid, R. T.
Robinson, T.
Roe, T.
Rountree, J.
Russell, E. R.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Shirley, W. S.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Thomas, A.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watson, T.
Watt, H.
Will, J. S.
Wilson, H. J.
Winterbotham, A. B.

TELLERS.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Esslemont, P.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Asher, A.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, H.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Charrington, S.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Dugdale, J. S.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Farquharson, H. R.
Feilden, Lt.-Gen. R. J.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitz-Wygram, General Sir F. W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Flower, C.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fulton, J. F.
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Grimston, Viscount
Grotrian, F. B.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.

Hunt, F. S.
Isaacs, L. H.
Jackson, W. L.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Kay-Shuttleworth, rt. hon. Sir U. J.
Kelly, J. R.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Lethbridge, Sir R.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclure, J. W.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Marjoribanks, rt. hon. E.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
More, R. J.
Morrison, W.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Murdoch, C. T.
Noble, W.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Powell, F. S.
Raikes, rt. hon. H C.
Rankin, J.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, D.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Tapling, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Townsend, F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
Weymouth, Viscount
White, J. B.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wilson, Sir S.
Winn, hon. R.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.

TELLERS.

Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

MR. PARNELL (Cork): What I must suggest for the consideration of the Government is, whether it would not be more convenient to the House to commence the important debate which will take place on the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) at an Evening Sitting rather than at a Morning Sitting on Wednesday? If the Government would acquiesce in that suggestion, as far as I and my hon. Friends are concerned, we should not be unwilling to withdraw from our opposition to the present stage of the Address to-night, provided it was understood that my hon. Friend should be allowed facilities on Report for bringing forward and discussing his Motion. Under those circumstances, I do not see that the Government need not be able to get through their other Business and start upon the Estimates on Monday.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): As far as I could understand from the remarks of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) the whole of the rest of the week will be occupied with the debate on the Address, and also that no debate on the Address is to take place to-morrow—to-morrow is to be lost. ["No, no!"] Sir, that is not an arrangement which would conduce to the progress of Public Business, or to the convenience of the House; nor can I admit that the hon. Member, by the conduct of his Party in the course of the evening, has any title to make a suggestion for the convenience of the House which will have any weight with Her Majesty's Government.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 1*st September*, 1886.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered* — *First Reading*—Sale under Legal Process * [43].
Withdrawn—Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment * [15].

QUESTION.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — A CONVICT DEPOT, TAYLOR'S HILL, CO. GALWAY.

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of a Convict Depôt at Taylor's Hill, Galway; why no action was taken on the Report of the Vice Regal Commission appointed by Lord Carnarvon, approving of the establishment of a Convict Depôt there, the convicts to be employed at works recommended by said Commission for the improvement of Galway Harbour; and, if he could explain the reason of the delay in the erection of the Constabulary Barracks?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the Irish Government had by no means abandoned the intention to establish a convict labour prison at Galway. If the hon. Member would look at the Estimates for the Prison Service for the current year, he would find that an item of £10,000 odd was taken for the purpose of the gaol in question. The matter was one in which he took a great personal interest, and he should give his best attention to the subject. He knew nothing of the Constabulary Barracks to which the hon. Member referred; but if he would say where they were situated he would make inquiry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [TENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [19th August]—[See page 96.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS IN BELFAST—REMEDIAL MEASURES.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): I beg to move to amend the Address by adding at the end these words—

> "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that certain circumstances, accountable for the recent outbreak, prolongation, and repeated renewals of riots, raids for plunder, and conflicts with the Forces of the Crown, in Belfast, dictate the necessity for the prompt adoption of special measures for the maintenance of social order there, and that the most imperative and urgent of these measures are, the re-establishment of Her Majesty's authority in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters, the limitation of all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown, in times of public emergency, and adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, to magistrates directly responsible to Her Majesty' Government, and the increase of the local Constabulary Force to such a strength as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency, until Parliament, on consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, can proceed to the application of adequate permanent measures for the protection of life and property in certain quarters of Belfast."

It has been suggested that the discussion upon this Amendment, which I hope the House will admit has not been conceived and is not expressed in any contentious spirit, might have the effect of provoking fresh outrages and disorder in Belfast. Sir, I am not willing to abandon my Constitutional function and my public right in view of any such suggestion. My constituents for the last three months, off and on, have had their houses wrecked and plundered, and their lives and properties placed in danger; and it certainly is startling to me to find the suggestion that, after three months of a carnival of riot and murder, the Representative of a division of Belfast in this House is to be silent because the tender susceptibilities of the people, who for the last three months have been wrecking houses and breaking heads, would be hurt by a calm and serious debate in this House. However, I do not apprehend at present any fresh outbreak of disorder. The Mayor of Belfast, a friend of the noble Lord the Leader of this House, has, after three months of dallying with riot, at last, the day before yesterday, issued a proclamation declaring that the time had come for the restoration of order. Well, I should have thought that the time had long since come for maintaining law and order. Well, Sir, these riots were conceived, generated, and prosecuted in the interests of the present Government; and the ministers and fuglemen of disorder in Belfast are not likely to embarrass their friends. I, therefore, hold that for patent political reasons there is not any danger that a debate in this House at the present moment on these great and terrible events is likely to result in any recrudescence of disorder. It is also suggested that the debate on this Amendment will anticipate, in some degree, the work of the Commission of Inquiry. I submit that there are features of this question which are of instant urgency; and the House will agree with me, before I have gone much farther, that there are matters with which the Viceregal Commission of Inquiry cannot deal at all, and there are other matters in regard to dealing with which the Viceregal Commission will be too late. The Commission has not yet sat. The inquiry will be prolonged. The Report will have to be carefully considered; and, though the Report of the Belfast Commission of Inquiry may not, like the Reports of other Commissions, require from the noble Lord "immense consideration," it will, I venture to say, at least require extensive study, and the greater part of a year must elapse before any practical proposal, either of a legislative or of an administrative character, can issue out of the proceedings of the inquiry. Now, Sir, so far from waiting a year, there are aspects of this case in Belfast that will not brook one day's delay. I have noticed one of them in my Amendment. I have called on the Government to re-establish the authority of Her Majesty in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters. Now, an hon. Member on the other side of the House lately told the House that he had come here from the hunting field in order to assure himself that the Queen's writ would run in Ireland. I called the attention of the hon. Member, who has abandoned sport for politics, to this district of Belfast; and I can assure him, with regard to it, that the Queen's writ does not run in Belfast, because, by an arrangement between the Government and the rioters, the Queen's Police have been obliged to run out of it. One of the first acts of the present Government, after their accession to power, was to withdraw altogether the Constabulary Force on the 9th of August from Shankhill, a district of Belfast which has been undeniably the cradle and nursing place of the riots. I ask the hon. Gentleman who has come from the hunting field not to return until he has taken some steps to assure himself, not merely that the Queen's writ will run in Ireland, but that the Queen's authority will be restored in this district of Belfast. Sir, in this district, I should say, without descending into particulars, the police have been stoned, have been shot, have been imprisoned in their barracks, by a riotous mob, have been beleaguered in their barracks for days and nights together, have been exposed not merely to the violence of the mob, but to their contempt by being placed under the guard of bodies of military, who stood tranquilly and inactively between the rioters and the police, while volleys of stones were being discharged at the windows of the barracks. Now, Sir, the present Government are chiefly concerned for the integrity of the Empire. They strongly condemn the giving up of the Transvaal. That is very far away, very extensive, and very hard to hold; and all that I ask them is to turn their attention to a part of the Empire that is much nearer, to give their care to the part that is much smaller and much more easy to manage, and to put an end to the spectacle that has existed since the 9th of last month by a Proclamation of Her Majesty's Government—that is to say, the spectacle of an independent Republic, outside the sphere of the Constitution, outside the authority of the law, existing for three weeks together in the riotous district of Belfast—a district where, if the law has any function at all at present, that function is accomplished by stealth. The police dare not wear their uniforms. The Government send out detectives to serve the ordinary processes of the law, and these detectives are glad to return with the safety of their lives. And, therefore, my first demand is, that we shall have a clear reply in this debate, whether or not the Government will persist in laying before the people of Ireland and the people of the Empire the evil and pestilent example of yielding to disorder by allowing those who have maintained it for three months together to establish an independent Republic which scarcely acknowledges, so far as I can discover, even the nominal military suzerainty of the Crown. This is an urgent matter. There is no more urgent aspect of the question. I have not heard, Sir, though I have made sedulous inquiries, of any non-Catholic person in Belfast who has been deprived of his work and robbed of his means of living as a consequence of these lamentable riots. I am glad of it. I should regret that any citizen of any creed whatever should be deprived of his means of living by reason of proceedings so despicable as these. But, Sir, I am aware that as a consequence of political eloquence and political intrigue, 600 poor Catholic working men and women of Belfast had been turned from their work as a consequence of these riots, and are at this moment on the point of absolute destitution. They have been insulted at their work. I have heard of a poor Catholic girl, almost alone in a factory, where the workers were of the other creed, who was insulted by having a mock crucifix placed before her on her frame whilst she sat at her work. I am aware, Sir—every reader of the public Press is aware—that these poor Catholic people, by reason of these fiendish passions, excited by politicians for their own ends, have been insulted in the mills and in the factories. I know that bailiffs have been pursued and have had boiling water poured over them. I know that girls have been pursued by—I am sorry to say—people of the same sex and stripped of their clothes in the streets. I know that Sir Edward Harland, the Mayor of Belfast, and a friend of the noble Lord, has allowed every Catholic among the 6,000 persons employed on the Queen's Island to be first insulted and outraged at their work and then turned out of the place altogether. ["No!"] Who says "No?" [Sir JAMES CORRY (Armagh, Mid): I do.] I hope the hon. Member will prove it. My inquiries have led me to the conclusion that out of the 6,000 persons employed by Sir Edward Harland at the Queen's Island there were about 28 Catholics, and if you search on the Queen's Island you will find that these 28 Catholics have left. Why should they not leave? After repeated attacks by the masses of the non-Catholic working men on the few Catholics employed there, the outrages culminated one day by a lot of young men seizing an old man, and, after they had kicked him about they poured a bucket of boiling tar over him; and the correspondent of *The Times* jocosely remarked that after that "he cut a sorry figure." A Belfast paper, friendly to the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary, described the outrage as "a practical joke by Queen's Islanders," heading it "Tarring a Blacksmith." It wound up a graphic report of the outrage by an expression of wonder that the old man, who had prudently kept away during the height of the riot, should have been so reckless as to attempt to return to his work. Not only had the Catholic working men of the Island been disemployed, but the Corporation, the official concentration of the municipal life of Belfast, had disemployed 28 Catholic scavengers and carters. No Catholic is ever allowed to reach a higher position than that of scavenger or carter in the employment of that estimable body. As I have said, these outrages, this tarring, this pouring of boiling water, these pursuits through the streets, this whole course of insult, violence, and persecution, had resulted at this date in the disemployment of 600 working men and working women in Belfast, who had been employed in the mills and factories where the majority were of the other creed. Now, Sir, the noble Lord remarked in a recent speech, and I quite agree with him, that these riots have been followed by the arrest of business and industry, from which he feared, he said, the town will suffer for many and many a day. Indeed, I fear it will. The agents of Belfast houses returning from the Provinces are reporting during recent weeks the great falling off in orders, and I am informed that Catholic traders in all parts of Ireland are so filled with pain and indignation at the treatment of these poor innocent, helpless Catholic working people in the town of Belfast, that they have determined to close their orders, and send no more orders to that town. Now, upon the double ground that this question is urgent, I ask the Government, I ask the noble Lord, what they will do—what declarations, what appeals, they will make upon their authority and influence, in the course of this debate, to induce the employers of Belfast to return to their duty towards their Catholic working people, and to save that town of Belfast, the prosperity of which I most sincerely desire, from the disastrous calamity with which it is now threatened? Now, Sir, the destitution of these disemployed working people is so vast and so keen that the Catholic Bishop felt obliged last Sunday to order a collection to be made at the doors of all his churches. But, Sir, the destitution of 600 families, representing 3,000 souls, is not a need that can be met by any act of public beneficence; and I must ask the noble Lord to apply himself in this debate to the case of Sir Edward Harland, and the other Protestant employers in Belfast, to atone, so far as he can, for the mischievous influence he exercised—to restore these poor people to their means of living, and thus save the trade of the town from the resentment at the hands of Catholic traders in other parts of Ireland of which it stands in danger. Now, Sir, these riots were unquestionably of the utmost gravity; but their significance has been much misapprehended. It has been specially misapprehended by the Prime Minister, when he said that the riots indicated an abnormal state of society in Belfast. They only indicated an abnormal state of society in the minds of a few unscrupulous politicians. The Prime Minister was also in error when he pointed at the riots as proof that the community of Ireland lacked a homogeneous and concordant character. Sir, 20 years ago there were great riots in Belfast, and in recent times there were riots at Hyde Park, at Amsterdam, and at Chicago; but I have not heard these riots cited by any casuist as a proof that the people of England, or Holland, or the United States are lacking in that homogeneous and concordant character, which, in the opinion of the author of the phrase, is requisite for the enjoyment of Constitutional freedom and harmonious political action. But, Sir, the riots in Hyde Park, and Amsterdam, and Chicago were promptly and effectually dealt with. They were not conceived by persons in authority as a means of political intrigue; and they were not dangled, and rocked, and nursed into fiendish activity by those to whom the Constitution has confided the preservation of the peace. Another misapprehension I have seen in a leading Tory journal in Belfast, which said that these riots had proved that the men of Ulster could not be cowed, and that the riots have struck a nail into the coffin of Home Rule. If by the "men of Ulster" is meant the rioters, I can only say that never upon any day, from the 4th of June to the 20th of August, was there made at any moment any sincere and intelligent atempt to cow them or even to subdue them. And, with regard to the nail in the coffin of Home Rule, all I have to say is, that in Ireland, at any rate, it is usual to wait for the death before you order the coffin. I can only say that the patient, Home Rule, is getting on as well as could be expected, and that the best doctors expect a speedy recovery. It is absurd, Sir, to endeavour to connect these riots in any special and peculiar sense with the question of Home Rule at all. Why, before Home Rule was even heard of there were plenty of riots in Belfast. This recent series of riots is the fourth that has taken place in the lifetime of the present generation. I may say that about the time of the previous riots, in 1857, street preaching was common in Belfast; and it provoked such disorder and violence that the magistrates decided if they could to suppress it. They requested the ardent Gospellers to give up street preaching; and all did so except a cleric well known to fame as the Rev. Mr. Hanna. He persisted in his offensive and insulting method of street preaching; but, in order to get rid of the question of obstructing the thoroughfares, he told his admirers who gathered to hear him on Sunday to leave a small space outside the crowd for the convenience of passers-by, and to call that space "the Pope's path." Well, after such a name was given publicly to "the Pope's path," passers-by got very little chance of passing without being hustled and insulted; and the consequence of Mr. Hanna's eloquence was an outbreak of riots, which lasted for a week, which led to the sacking of many houses, and the taking of many lives, and it required an army to put it down. Well, Sir, the Rev. Mr. Hanna is an impenitent sinner. He was not converted to the ways of order by the fact that he was sternly censured by the Commission of 1857. He was a leading figure in the riots of 1864, and he has been a leading figure in the riots of this present year. *Punch*, in 1857, in a parody on Lord Tennyson's well-known ballad, *Oriana*, expressed what it believed to be public opinion concerning this distinguished character—

"The row to you was owing, roaring Hanna."

In the month of January this year, at a public meeting in Belfast, the Rev. Dr. Hanna, with all the fanaticism and more than the vigour of youth, appeared in the ripe maturity of his age as the chief inciter to riot. What did he say in January at a public meeting? He said—

> "I have clear and definite knowledge that at this moment seditionists of Ireland are planning to confiscate all the property of the Loyalists, and to distribute it among themselves."

[*A laugh.*] Does the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) apprehend that any of us is going to take hold of his estate?

> "There was one prosperous district in the County Tyrone," the rev. gentleman said, "which was occupied by respectable Presbyterian farmers. A branch of the National League sat there on the Sabbath Day, and the subscribers to the National League balloted for the occupation of the farms of these prosperous Presbyterian farmers in succession to their present owners."

That was an infamous and and despicable falsehood; it has been by this time admitted to be so. No one would venture at this date to utter such a lie. But it was like the American candidate who accused his opponent of having killed a man, and when he succeeded in the election afterwards, he was asked why he had accused his opponent of having killed a man. He said the corpse was good enough for the election. This story had helped to defeat the late Liberal Government, and to secure the return of the Tory Government at the last Election. It came nearer home. Will the House bear in mind the attack on the shipwrights of the 4th of June? Dr. Hanna, before the event, said—

> "There is a Nationalist rivetter on the Queen's Island, and he is to be the successor of Mr. W. J. Porie, the manager of that magnificent establishment, while Mr. Porie is to be relegated to service in a blacksmith's shop in Connemara; while one Paddy O'Rafferty, who has been picked up in the slums of Belfast, is to succeed Sir Edward Harland as the next Mayor of Belfast."

Dr. Hanna—will the House believe it?—so extraordinary is the inversion of the intelligent rules of administration in Ireland—is actually a member of the Board of Commissioners of National Education in Ireland. He is one of the two chief clerical firebrands in the North. He is in that respect the rival of Dr. Kane, and the Rev. Dr. Kane and the Rev. Dr. Hanna were the two gentlemen who were foremost in welcoming the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer to Belfast. On the 22nd of February last the Rev. Dr. Hanna rode to Belfast in the public procession in the carriage with the noble Lord, and the other Rev. Doctor rode in the carriage next behind. Not only in 1857, but in 1864, there were riots. In 1864, in the City of Dublin, the people had a great procession in honour of the inauguration of a statue of O'Connell. Belfast could not allow Dublin to express its mind in peace. I remember the occasion well. I was in Dublin at the time. There was a magnificent spectacle. The day was one of unbroken peace. No angry word was spoken. But certain politicians in Belfast—certain leaders, lay and clerical, to whom the pulpit is more the Orange drum than the drum ecclesiastic—could not be satisfied to let the people of Dublin express their feeling in regard to O'Connell without a counter-demonstration. They set to work to defame the memory of the popular patriot. They did it on the platform and in the Press. On the day of the demonstration in Dublin, an effigy of O'Connell, decked out in every kind of offensive attire, was carried through the town. It was then placed in a coffin, was again carried through the town, followed by strains of mock funereal music; and when the rioters had failed to obtain admission to a cemetery for the purpose of burying it in contempt, they burnt it on one of the bridges, and the ashes were strewn over the river. This exasperated the Catholics; it touched them on the tenderest point next to their religion—their devotion to their country and to the memory of the great man who had served them. The riots broke out; they lasted for a fortnight; houses were wrecked; lives were taken. It required an army of 6,000 men to restore peace and order. One of the notable incidents in the riots of 1864 was that the rivetters and shipwrights of the Queen's Island left their work in a great body, rushed down upon the docks, where there was a large number of Catholics, pushed them into the water, and when they were in the water fired upon them, and fired upon them with fatal consequences. Again in 1872 there were riots. What is the use of saying that Home Rule, and Home Rule alone, produced this disorder in Belfast? Home Rule had not been heard of in 1872. The Catholics held a political meeting. To avoid provocation of disturbance they held it miles outside the town; but there was a procession, and the procession was attacked on the way back to the town. The Catholics defended themselves; riots broke out for the third time in a generation. They lasted for a week. The usual consequences followed. Parts of the city looked as if they had been subjected to a siege, and again the services of 5,000 or 6,000 men were required in order to restore tranquillity. Now, after what I have said, will any hon. Member allege against me that these recent riots could be said to furnish, in any sense worthy of the attention of rational men, an argument against Home Rule? The truth of the matter is that in Belfast, as in every other great town of the world perhaps, but especially in Belfast, there is a permanent force which could be turned out at any time and for any cause in the interests of disorder, if leading men—responsible men in public life—think it consistent with conscience, with duty, and with respectability, to excite that portion of the population. If the cause were not Home Rule, it would be something else. It would be street preaching; it would be a public meeting to pay respect to the memory of a dead patriot; it would be the holding of a political meeting outside the town. It is not Home Rule; it is that there are certain men in public life—the Leaders of Parties—who occasionally, from time to time, seize or make some pretext or other to excite the men over whose minds and passions they have control against the minority of the people of that town. As often as these leading men think it needful or desirable to excite disorder, disorder will be excited; and, whether you pass Home Rule or whether you withhold it, you will have an occasional occurrence of disorder unless you take one or other of two steps. There are only two ways to meet it. The one way is to compel the public inciters to disorder to bear the responsibility of their actions. The other way is to do what was done at Hyde Park, to do what was done at Amsterdam, and to do what was done at Chicago—that is, to bring out the public forces, not for show, but for use; to bring out the public forces, not to subject one branch of them to humiliation and make the other branches stand inactive to be jeered at by the rioters; but, if occasion arises, to use it promptly, to use it decisively, and in the manner in which the police themselves say they would have been used if they had been employed in any other part of Ireland. The police and their officers say, what I most thoroughly believe, that if, without any resort to firearms, they had been allowed to use the baton as they would use it in any ordinary case of riot elsewhere—as it would be used in England or in any other country of the world, or any other town of the Kingdom but Belfast—and if they had been allowed to use the baton against the rioters at the outset, the riots would never have proceeded beyond the second day. I do not mean by this to direct, or even to infer any censure upon the right hon. Gentleman who lately was Chief Secretary for Ireland. [*Ironical Ministerial cheers.*] Oh, well, you will see in a moment. He provided an extra police force that was amply sufficient for every purpose of maintaining the peace; but that force was held back by its officers. The force was humiliated, was debilitated, and emasculated by the action of the local magistrates, who when they are not Orangemen themselves are for the most part sympathizers with the most violent members of the Orange Order, and who certainly sympathize to the bottom of their hearts with the political purposes of these riots. Well, there is one fact I wish to write firmly and deeply into the minds of the House. Ireland is a country of about 4,000,000 Catholics and 1,000,000 Protestants. The Catholics in all Ireland, except the four North-Eastern counties, in every considerable town in Ireland, except Belfast, are a vast majority. Does anyone allege that in the parts of Ireland, in county or town, where Catholics are in a majority, a Protestant is ever hurt in his person or his property, or is molested in his conscience or in his opinion by reason of his religious belief? If the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) lived beside me in Dublin, or lived in the place where I spent a great part of my life in the wildest part of Munster, where the population is intensely Catholic, his life and property would be as safe, his worship would be as free, and his conscience would be as unmolested as if he lived in the heart of Sandy Row. Why is it that these religious riots only arise where the Catholics are in a minority? Does anyone suggest that while the Catholics, without exception, refrain from these disgraceful excesses where they are in a vast majority, that they burst out in a persecuting spirit where they are in a minority? Belfast is a city of 220,000 inhabitants, of whom only 60,000 are Catholics, and when I place that fact before the House I leave the answer to the question I have put in their hands —namely, whether the Catholics are likely to indulge in courses leading to riot, when they are morally certain to get the worst of it? The answer will suggest itself at once to every fair-minded man. Now I have to ask you when these riots originated? They broke out with the murder of Patrick Boyd on the 4th of June. But they were generated upon an earlier day. I can supply the House with the genesis of these riots, in the words of the hon. and gallant Member for Armagh. He spoke at an Orange demonstration in London on the 25th of March, and he said—

> "Last December I met one of the most distinguished statesmen in this country, who happened to be in Ireland at the time, and told him some of the strength and determination of the Orangmen of Ulster. 'If you ask me (said the gentleman referred to) when the time comes I will come over to Ulster.'"

The hon. and gallant Gentleman replied that until his Friend did so he would never understand what the Orangemen were and what they meant. Therefore the noble Lord went to Ireland, upon the admission now so cheerfully made by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, to find out what the Orangemen were and what the Orangemen meant. "That statesman," said the hon. and gallant Gentleman, "was Lord Randolph Churchill." The hon. and gallant Gentleman told the noble Lord the Leader of the House that when his Lordship entered Ulster he would receive such a reception as he never got before, and never may get again. I may, perhaps, say that the noble Lord may wish that he never will get such a reception again in that city — the city of the riots—from 120,000 determined men who had assembled for a double purpose: for the purpose, first, of admiration of the noble Lord; and, for the second purpose, of bringing the conviction to his mind that there was in Ireland a great organized Institution, composed of men determined, at all hazards and costs, to maintain the great principle of loyalty to the Protestant faith on which their Institution was founded. What ails the Protestant faith? Who in the world wants to interfere with it? We can save our souls in our way, and we are quite willing for them to save their souls in their own way. Another speaker at the same meeting was more plain. The Rev. Dr. Potter said—

> "As to the bayonets of the British Army being used against the Loyalists, first of all, let them present the bayonets, and then see what would become of them."

This gentleman, a true member of the Church militant, stated that if the bayonets of the Queen's troops should be presented against the Loyalists, as the Arabs had found it easy to twist the bayonets, the Orangemen, with hearts of oak and fibres of steel, could easily manage to wrench them off their muskets. I would ask that the House should have some explanation whether such language as this is consistent with effusive declarations of loyalty, or with the Oath of Allegiance. Now, Sir, the riots were generated in the manner described by the hon. and gallant Gentleman on February 22. The noble Lord will never forget it. He went to Belfast fresh from high Office in the State. He had recently been a Member of the Cabinet, a Minister of the Crown. He was still at the moment in the position of a Privy Councillor of the Crown. I suppose the noble Lord has mastered the Constitutional theory that the laws of this Kingdom are made upon the will of the electors of this Kingdom. The noble Lord went to Ireland to oppose the policy of Home Rule. Well, Sir, I hope I do not say too much in saying that the House had a right to expect from him—a man who had recently been a Member of the Ministry; a man who, no doubt, looked forward to being a Member of the Ministry again; a man who was still in the high, responsible position of an Adviser of the Crown—the House might, I say, expect from such a man, even in opposing the policy of Home Rule and in counselling his followers, that he was strictly bound to advise his followers to keep within the limits of Constitutional agitation. It was open to him to advise them to express their views by public resolutions, and to support them by the highest and most ardent language. It was open to him to petition the House, and to tell his followers to use their votes to send to the House men whom they could depend on, to whom they might give their aid in opposing laws of which they disapproved, and in passing laws of which they approved.

Before I ask the question of the noble Lord, let me remind the House that he knew as well as any man that some time before a Gentleman, since known as Lord Iddesleigh, had visited that city and made an inflammatory speech. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and laughter.*] I understand the meaning of that laughter. I admit that a burning utterance does not accord well with the character of Lord Iddesleigh as it ordinarily exhibits itself; but there seems to be something in the political atmosphere of Belfast which even the most phlegmatic Saxon could not resist. Lord Iddesleigh made a speech in which he told the Orangemen to prove their earnestness, and not to fire their rifles in the gaiety of their hearts. The body guard which accompanied Lord Iddesleigh, coming back from the place of gathering, made an attack on the Convent of the Sisters of Nazareth. [*Cries of* "No!"] Well, Sir, I can only say that whatever happened at the Convent when the body guard was coming back, this was one of the effects—the Superioress of the Convent—a foreign lady advanced in years and in very delicate health—died from the shock of the event, and that Lord Iddesleigh, on the following day, in accordance with what would be expected from him, wrote a public letter, deeply regretting the matter and expressing his sympathy. In similar circumstances, Sir, I have not heard that the noble Lord the Leader of the House has written any public letter. The noble Lord was well aware that his Friends in Ulster had, for two or three years before, been sowing broadcast inflammatory incitements to civil war. He knew that a system of war administration had been organized. He knew that lives had been lost in consequence of that policy, and that Lord Spencer—then admired by the noble Lord and his Friends—was obliged to issue proclamations preventing illegal interference by followers of the noble Lord. The noble Lord knew as well as any man in Ireland that he was coming into a political furnace, and notwithstanding this he proceeds forthwith to stir the heat. The moment the noble Lord had touched Irish soil the keynote of strife was struck. Previously an Orange Lodge in Antrim had stated that—

> "Home Rule for Ireland would involve the land in the horrors of a civil war."

Another Association had resolved—

> "That owing to our peacefulness and abhorrence of agitation we have been ignored by some English statesmen; but if this be so, if we are compelled, we shall prove to England that her garrison has not degenerated since the days of the Boyne."

Then, Sir, the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh was master of ceremonies to the noble Lord. [Colonel SAUNDERSON: No, no.] Sir, the hon. and gallant Member took it upon himself to describe the purpose and meaning of the visit, for he said—

> "That the noble Lord has come to try and find out if we are ready if necessary to stand by our own cause; and I think that we will show that we are."

The hon. and gallant Member and the noble Lord, when the time for the demonstration came, found it convenient to be absent. Then the noble Lord, having received the addresses and having stated, in his opening words, that he could claim kinship with Lord Castlereagh, the architect of the Union, and with the great Duke of Marlborough, used these words never to be forgotten—

> "Oh, gentlemen, you have great privileges in this loyal North; they are privileges which are worth defending, worth demonstrating for; by heavens, gentlemen, it may be these privileges are worth fighting for."

Sir, fighting with whom? Fighting in what defence? Will the noble Lord explain? The noble Lord was received by the two chief clerical firebrands of the North—the Rev. Dr. Kane and the Rev. Dr. Hanna—and in view of subsequent events, I wish the House to know that the action of the shipwrights of Sandy Row and Shankhill Road on the 4th of June, the public Press has shown to be the cause of the riot and ravage, and also that the names of the Shipwrights' Lodge and the Sandy Row Heroes, are among the Orange Lodges which received the noble Lord. Here are some—the Belfast Invincibles, Sandy Row True Blues, Sandy Row Heroes, the Shankhill Purple Stars, the Shankhill Road Purple Marksmen — I say nothing of their recent displays, the Shankhill Road Heroes, the Duke of Abercorn's Invincibles, and the Duke of Manchester's Invincibles. The address was read by Dr. Kane, and Dr. Kane contributed his quota not to the maintenance of peace, but to put bad feeling between the two classes by reading an address in which he described the

Catholic people as "ignorant multitudes, the slaves of a foreign superstition." Now, Sir, the noble Lord immediately on hearing this said it would be the vaguest and crudest of dreams to think that a great metropolis like Belfast, with all its inhabitants, would submit to Parliamentary government. I should like to know, Sir, on what theory the people of Belfast have any right to resist not merely the general will of the people of Ireland, but the general will of Great Britain? In the evening a meeting was held in the Ulster Hall, and the chair was occupied by the noble Lord the Member for North-West Down (Lord Arthur Hill), who said—

> "We are called upon to uphold these liberties which are now threatened. We will do so in the same manner as they did long ago. The Orangemen of Ireland will, to a man, be ready to maintain these liberties."

On the same occasion, Dr. Kane described Home Rule as a policy of surrender to the dynamitards and daggermen and Archbishop Walsh—Archbishop Walsh, the great ecclesiastic and wise publicist who now occupies the See of Dublin! Dr. Kane went on to say—

> "We do not recognize in this Parliament"—that was the Imperial Parliament—"or even in Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, any power to transfer us to the jurisdiction of Irish rebels, any more than to the Grand Turk or King Theebaw."

I think, Sir, if any hon. Member presumes to rise in this debate, and endeavours to put into Parliamentary language the theory broached by Dr. Kane that it is the right of any body of men in Belfast to rise in arms against the law passed by this Parliament, and assented to by the Queen, for placing the legal force in the hands of the Irish people, I think any Member broaching that theory here would soon find himself in difficulty with the Chair. Yet the noble Lord having heard from Dr. Kane the doctrine that they recognized no power in that Parliament to pass, or even Her Majesty the Queen to assent to, a certain law, immediately described Dr. Kane as a trusted public leader, and he then went on to deliver a speech in which he said—

> "I am anxious to ascertain how you propose to face and deal with this crisis, that is, the contingency of Home Rule, and the resources you can reckon upon, and to what length your resistance may go."

That was answered by cheers, and a voice—"To the death." A great deal of uncertainty, the noble Lord said, existed in the public mind in England, adding—

> "You will find things greatly changed since the days of 1848, when the Government served out arms to the Orangemen. . . . Now they will have to find arms for themselves. Statements made to the Imperial Parliament as to the strength and numbers of the Orange Party are received with shouts of derision by Radicals and Parnellites. There is a general misbelief in England as to the amount of resistance the Loyalists can offer to Repeal. The process of resistance to this policy meditated by this combination primarily rests with you—upon you lies this most tremendous responsibility, and to you the issue means everything, honour, religion, and liberty. Aye, and I think after what I have read of 1641"—the noble Lord went back 245 years to find a case for exciting fear and passion—"it means possibly not only all that makes life worth having, but it means even life itself."

Sir, is that the conduct of a Constitutional politician? He knew that the policy of Home Rule was about to be submitted to the House of Commons, and he knew that if the House of Commons adopted it, it would have had to be revised in "another place;" and he knew that it would come before the supreme Constitutional tribunal of Great Britain. Every man, and especially every man who has held the Office of Privy Councillor, could not but know all this; and yet he ventured to suggest to these excited men in Belfast, in this historic centre of excitement and riot, that the passing of a certain law by this Parliament meant the loss of honour, of liberty, of religion, and possibly the loss of life. All that he said to them. What was their remedy? He said—

> "It is only by demonstrations the most imposing, by energy the most striking, aye, and by actions the most resounding, that you can rivet the attention of the Democracy of England on any part of public affairs. You are, gentlemen, I believe—and this is one of the things I care to say to you—you are in this great crisis the first line of defence, and the second line of defence; and the question I have to ask you is this—are you the same men as your forefathers were in 1798?"

Did the noble Lord know what he was saying? Did he know that he was referring to a period when Orange Societies sprang into life out of the massacres? Does he know he referred to the time when Lord Gosport, the Lieutenant of the county of Armagh, declared to the magistrates of that county that the Catholics of the North-East were certain to be attacked on every side, driven from their homes and from that part of the country, and were the victims of lawless banditti? Does he know that he referred to a time when, according to the evidence taken before the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Lords, the Orange Society and every member of it took the oath of extermination, and that, according to the current records, the oath ran thus—

> "I, A B, do swear that I will be true to the King and the Government, and I will exterminate the Catholics of Ireland so far as in my power lies."

[An hon. MEMBER: How do you know that?] How do I know that? It is true that the history of that oath has been disputed; but I know that witnesses testified to its existence, whether they knew it or not, before the Secret Committee of the House of Lords, I think, in 1798; and one Member of the Administration of the Government, who was either a Member of that Committee or was examined before it, and must have known what he spoke about, declared that the Government had no connection with the Orange Society, nor with the oath of extermination. Does the noble Lord know that I refer to a period when there was another Orange oath taken to this effect?—

> "I, A B, swear I will support and defend the King and his heirs so long as he and they support the Protestant ascendancy."

Sir, I am sorry to say it, that the whole speech of the noble Lord seems to me to have tended to excite the spirit expressed in the oath of extermination, and that the whole speech seems to have urged the principle embodied in it, because if the speech meant anything it meant this—that so long as this Parliament and the Queen would enact laws agreeable to the Orangemen of Ulster so long the Orangemen of Ulster would be loyal, but that as sure as a law was passed that they considered inconvenient it was their duty to rise in arms. I am bound to say that if that is not the meaning I cannot discover any other meaning of the noble Lord. But that was not enough. The noble Lord felt it necessary to make a more direct appeal to the passions of the Orangemen. He said—

> "There is something very sad in the connection between the local clergy and the local branches of the National League, because from the peculiar practices of the Church of Rome, the most cherished practices, many of the priests who take part in the National League must know beyond a doubt the inseparable connection that exists between crime and the local branches of the League."

I think the attack upon the practices of the Catholic Church comes with very bad grace from the noble Lord. What would the Home Secretary say to that? If he thinks of the confessional, as he suggests, it is very strange that the noble Lord should place in such a position as that of Home Secretary in this House a Gentleman who is obliged by his creed to conform with the practice of that faith. I say deliberately, if the noble Lord knew anything whatever, and he can know nothing whatever, of the practice of the Catholic Church, he would know that the confessional is the most powerful agency for the prevention of premeditated crime, for the fulfilment of every possible reparation, and for the punishment of crime the most powerful agency that modern society possesses. The noble Lord also appealed to memories of conflict and strife in Ireland, to memories of repression with impunity by one class and creed. He went back to the penal days, the memory of which turned men's blood. He said—

> "From generation to generation all those memories have been carefully transmitted, and the time is approaching of test and trial for you, a time to say whether all these symbols and forms practised in your Orange Lodges are real living forms, and not idle or meaningless symbols."

I presume that the noble Lord will feel it incumbent upon him to explain to the House what he meant by this extraordinary reference. I now come to the final indictment.

> "I should add" said the noble Lord, "that if the struggle should continue and develop, and my calculation should turn out to be wrong, then I am not of the opinion, and never have been of the opinion, that this struggle is likely to remain within the limits of what we are accustomed to look upon as Constitutional action. Any change so portentous as the Repeal of the Union—any change so gigantic—can hardly be accomplished by the mere passing of law."

[The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill): Hear, hear!] The House will, I think, await with curiosity, and will hear with interest, upon what warrant the noble Lord has taken upon himself to revise the British Constitution. Finally, he said, if Parliament should pass a measure of Home Rule, he did not hesitate to say that there would not be wanting men of position and influence—am I wrong in saying he included himself?—who were willing to cast in their lot with them, whatever it might be, and share their fortunes and their fate. The noble Lord closed with a grotesque parody of Campbell's fine invocation to the men of Munich when he called on those who heard him "to rush to glory and the brave," and bade Ulster "all her banners wave and charge with all her chivalry." But when Ulster, for lack of banners, was charging with stones, the noble Lord was fishing in Norway. The advice of the noble Lord was understood to mean that in the event of the passing of a certain law the Orangemen were to rise in arms against it. More direct incitement, however, was given by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). In the interval between that incitement and the speech of the noble Lord, which lit a fire which, if it has been put out, has been put out in blood—the Kanes and the Hannas, the lay and the clerical leaders, and the Grand Masters made speeches, and the Tory leader writers wrote articles breathing nothing but a spirit of internecine strife and of civil war. The month of May arrived, and the Home Rule policy had come to its trial. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham wrote a letter to Mr. Bolton, the late Member for St. Pancras, in which he said that if the people of Ulster were in earnest in refusing to agree to intrust their fortunes to an Irish Parliament their fellow-subjects in England would not allow them to be coerced into so doing. But 1,250,000 of their fellow-subjects in England have expressed an opposite view already. The meaning I understand to be that they were to prove themselves to be in earnest before the General Election. The noble Lord, if strictly construed, meant that they should rise into arms, after the passing of the law. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham, on the other hand, advised them to rise before. Between the two statesmen the advice they gave was comprehensive. It was not enough to publish the strength of the Orange Army, and issue advertisements for rifles and for drill instructors, the right hon. Member for West Birmingham wanted them to prove that they were in earnest. Now, this statesman wrote another letter to Mr. Sinclair, saying he was to see a growing feeling in Ulster, and that it would have a great influence on ordinary Englishmen, who hardly appreciated the fact that there were two nations in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I am convinced that the Loyalists of Ireland will not quietly submit themselves to the control of a Dublin Parliament which they believe would be hostile to their material and religious interests."

And, this was the Gentleman who, not very long ago, described the Orangemen of Ulster as follows:—

> "If there is any danger to the peace of Ireland it lies in proceedings of certain sections of the population of Ulster—men of rank and education, who know enough to know better."

["Hear, hear!"] Well, I can hardly blame the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel Saunderson) for his cheer just now, because he has proved not that he knew enough to know better, but so little that he knew worse. Can anyone be surprised after what I have recited at the recent occurrences in Belfast? So far from these riots proving that there is anything abnormal in society in Ireland, or that the Irish people are not of a homogeneous and concordant character —which is an absurd phrase to employ —they prove, in my opinion, that the stimulations which were applied to the people of Belfast would, if applied to any great city or community in the world, produce precisely the same result. The riots I have said broke out on the 3rd of June. On that morning the principal Tory organ in Belfast invited the Loyalists of Belfast to devote the evening and the night of the day of Mr. Gladstone's defeat to a demonstration of delight—

> "Every Loyalist band should parade and discourse the stirring strains of Loyalty. Every hill should blaze with jubilant fire. Every corps in the Army of Ulster, whose disipline might justify it, should fire a *feu de joie*. The celebration should make an impression on the Empire, and sound the death-knell of Parnellism."

What happened after that? On the very morning after the Home Rule Division a great mob went over and assaulted a small body of Catholic workmen in the brickfields; and having driven them away, threw their tools into the river, and making a pile of their hats and clothes, made a fire of them. That was, I suppose, a demonstration by which the Tory Democracy proposed to sound the death-knell of Parnellism. A Belfast paper declared that the ruffianly section of the inhabitants of Belfast were the Catholics, represented by Mr. Sexton—

> "The scum of the Continental gaols, the off-scouring of the French galleys, are," said this paper, "not to be compared to the Nationalists who crowd round Mr. Sexton's Committee room."

The ground having been prepared in this manner, a dispute occurred between two workmen at the Alexandra Docks on the 3rd June. The reporter of *The Loyal and Patriotic Union* says—

> "The June riots arose out of an attack made by the Nationalists on a Protestant workman in Queen's Island. These men were the original aggressors. At a time when the prospect of Home Rule caused strong Party feelings, they told this workman that all his sort (Protestants) would be kicked out as soon as it was passed, and followed it up by assaulting him."

To show how unscrupulously the resources of falsehood have been used to produce this crisis, I shall read a few words from the sworn statement of the Catholic workman in question. He says that he and another man were engaged in working on a drain, when he made a suggestion as to how the work should be done. His fellow-workmen said—"You old ——, what do you know?" He replied—"If you call me an old —— again, I will hit you on the nose." The reply was—"This is what I wanted; I will soon get you out of this." And the man then walked away, although the other explained that he had only threatened to hit him in a joke. The next day the disturbance occurred. My firm opinion is that this incident of the 3rd June was deliberately brought about by this man Blakeley, who insulted his own overseer for the purpose of producing a pretext which could be used to incite the Protestant workmen of Belfast to attack their Catholic fellow-townsmen, and to produce, first of all, an effect on the division in this House; and, secondly, on the General Election. What happened next day? At the dinner hour a body of Protestant workmen, variously estimated at from 500 to 2,000, left the works at Queen's Island, marched to the docks where the navvies were at work, armed with banners, sticks, pieces of iron, nuts, and bolts, the property of the Mayor. Having driven some of the Catholic navvies into the water, they beat the men who remained on shore so terribly that some of them had to be taken to the hospital, and they then threw the missiles at the men who were in the water. A poor boy named Curran, of the age of 16, too sickly to work himself, who had come down with his parent's dinner, was treated in a similar manner. A man made an effort to save him. He was obliged by the missiles which were thrown from the shore to let go the boy and save himself. The evidence of the witnesses before the Coroner was that as often as the boy rose in the water missiles were thrown at him; and when he sank for the last time there were cries from the shore—"There is another Home Ruler gone." The Island men that evening marched home defiantly past the Catholic quarter. The funeral of James Curran was attacked on the Sunday. For three days every incitement was applied to the passions of the Catholic population. I say that, seeing that neither in revenge for the murder of Curran, nor for the attack on the funeral, nor for the attack on the Catholic workmen on the morning after the rejection of the Home Rule Bill, did the Catholics retaliate, that finally and conclusively proves that the Catholic people were determined to keep within the lines of the law and stand on the principles of defence. I challenge scrutiny into every incident of the riots of June and August. ["Oh, oh!"] Have I not given one? Have I not shown that the incident of the 3rd of June had no connection with religion or politics, that the affair of the 4th of June was a violent and aggravated outrage? I should be able to show, in like manner, that the riots of July sprang out of the Orange anniversary—out of an occasion when the passions of the Orangemen are excited from the platform and from the pulpit; and I could again prove the forbearance of the Catholics by the fact that the Orange celebration and the great procession passed over without an act of interference on the part of a single Catholic. How did the riots of August break out? We have been told that they broke out in an attack upon a Sunday-school procession. I have received a statement of the facts from a committee of Catholic gentlemen composed of magistrates, merchants, and professional men and others. I have tested their statement by all the means of information in my power, and I find it to be perfectly accurate. They say—

> "The 31st July was appointed by the Tory papers as the fit day to celebrate the accession of the Tory Government. The Rev. Hugh Hanna, more widely known as Roaring Hanna, chose it for a school excursion. No one doubted the consequences. Mr. Hanna was for once amenable to reason, and sent the children home quietly after their return, but his Orange boys determined that they would have some amusement. They seized on the band which had accompanied their children at their pic-nic, and made them march before the mob playing Party tunes. On approaching the Donegall Street Police Station they groaned the police, and one man stoned the police. This was the first attack. When the mob reached the corner of Carrick Hill and Clifton Street they smashed the window of Mr. Kernan's public-house. At this time Colonel Forbes was brutally attacked and severely wounded by the Orange mob. The police were stoned here so severely that they were obliged to charge with the baton. The mob then ran down Stanhope Street to the Old Lodge Road. Here they smashed every window in the public-house of Mr. Stephen M'Kenna, destroyed furniture, and turning on the taps allowed the liquors to run on the floor. It was a terrible wreck. Mr. M'Kenna was struck by a stone on the knee and hurt severely. Again, in the evening, the mob came and smashed the window-shutters, which had been put up after the first wrecking. The public-house of Mr. John Riordan was then wrecked, the taps turned on, and the place plundered. All valuable property was destroyed. Policemen then came up. With difficulty they made some arrests, and were mercilessly stoned. A rush was then made to enter Carrick Hill, a Catholic quarter, and the police were terribly stoned, but managed to keep them back. The mob were like wild beasts."

The short and long of the story is this—that from the first of these riots to the last the police were held back by the local magistrates. Firearms were sometimes taken out of their hands, at other times they were forbidden to use their batons; and, without attempting to anticipate any decision that may be come to as to individual deaths or individual constables, I say the constables, as a force, so far from being allowed to maintain peace or restore it, were only allowed to use their rifles, or even their batons, when their own lives had come to be in instant danger. The riots had two features—they consisted either in attacks on the shops of Catholics in a non-Catholic district, or else in attempts to enter a Catholic district in force. What did the Catholics do? When attacks were made on houses in non-Catholic districts the Catholics could do nothing; but when the rioters attempted to enter a Catholic district what the Catholics did was to rush out of their houses, assemble in the street and defend themselves to keep the non-Catholic mob from entering their streets; because, as we know from what happens, if the rioters entered the result would be the wrecking of the houses of Catholics and the sacrificing of their lives. When the police were not on the spot the Catholics took up their own defence, but as soon as the police or soldiers came the Catholics instantly surrendered the work of defence to its proper guardians. I say the Coroner also has embarrassed the operations of the law. The Coroner is one of the oddest functionaries in the world. He said if there had been no police there would have been no killing. As for the verdicts of wilful murder against the police, I say nothing of my own, but I refer to the remarks of counsel before the Commission. He said the Coroner's juries were taken from the Shankhill district, and were composed partly of rioters themselves, and for the rest of sympathizers with them. At every turn of this miserable and wretched affair the administration of the law has been slandered, hampered, defeated by those who rejoiced in the inception of those riots, by those who regarded those riots as furthering their political ends. The Mayor allowed his men to insult and outrage the Catholics. Usually if a boy stole a paint brush or a piece of iron he would have him in the dock, and would prosecute him vigorously; but those shipwrights by the hundred, leaving their work day after day, were allowed to fill their pockets with bolts, with nuts, with rivets, with solid balls of metal, all made out of the property of Sir Edward Harland, and these missiles, of the value of thousands of pounds—[*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—I should think a large nut is worth a penny or two, and I should think there were hundreds of thousands of them thrown—["Oh, oh!"]—well, in one house in one day there were 23 found. They were allowed to fill their pockets, although Sir Edward Harland had policemen at his gate to protect his property. They were allowed to throw those missiles from the 4th of June to the end of

August intermittently through the windows of public-houses owned by Catholics, and at the heads of policemen and their Catholic fellow-townsmen. I do not know whether the Home Secretary thinks the existence of a Sovereign Pontiff in a Southern Peninsula is any reason why missiles should be taken from a shipyard and thrown through the windows of Catholic public-houses. Moreover, if a trade dispute occurs between the Mayor's workmen and himself he locks them out till they come to his terms. Why did he never threaten to lock them out while they were accomplishing their daily march from the Queen's Island to Shankhill Road, crying—"Down with Home Rule, and to h—l with the Pope?" The Inspector General asked Sir Edward Harland to ask his workmen to go home from their work like any other workmen in any other city in the world, or in any other establishment in Belfast. Sir Edward Harland declined to interfere. He, as the head of the borough magistrates, listened to a threat from the Rev. Mr. Kane that unless the police were taken out of the Shankhill district he would take 20,000 Orangemen to turn them out of it. The Government yielded to that threat, and the Shankhill district is now an Independent Republic under the Presidency of Mr. President Kane. The magistrates, with the Mayor at their head, from June to the present month have never lost an opportunity of discrediting the police. At every one of their meetings they have asked for the withdrawal of the strange police. When I hear this talk of strange police, I ask what is the reason of it? It is simply that there is a larger proportion of Catholics in the police of the rest of Ireland than in the local Belfast force; but let the House remember that for many a year gone by those Catholic police had been employed throughout Ireland in evicting Catholics at the suit mostly of Protestant landlords, and although we have often complained of their conduct in this House, not one of us has ever raised the question of religion. The right hon. Gentleman has blamed the late Chief Secretary for Ireland for the course he pursued in regard to these riots, but he did what he could to protect the people of Belfast. He directed that an extra force of police should be sent there. He did not direct that they should be Roman Catholic police. He simply ordered police. The Inspector General of Constabulary, who is a Protestant, selected the men who were to go there. The local Justices of the Peace are Protestants, the local magistrates are Protestants, the very officers of the police are Protestants, and I do not wonder at the indignation felt by these poor Catholic policemen when they think of the services they have rendered, and the language that is now used about them by the people they have served. Listen to what one of them says on the subject. He says—

> "When we were filling arduous duties in the West and South of Ireland; when we had to evict the poor, half-starved peasantry, and put them out on the road side, we were then the white-haired boys of the Government, and a credit to our Queen and our country. Now we are nothing better than Joe Bradys. So says the man who passes us on the Sundays with a flower in his button-hole and his Bible in his hand, and who will turn out the poor old woman from her cottage on the Monday."

This outcry of the people of Belfast was at first directed against the strange police from a distance, but it is now directed against the local force. The whole object of this outcry is neither more nor less than for the purpose of getting rid of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and restoring the corrupt and partizan local force of police who existed before the riots of 1864, when the men who are now the borough magistrates were seated on the Town Council, and had the control of the local police which was condemned by the Commission of 1864. The Town Councillors of that day are now borough magistrates, and they are now endeavouring to degrade the Royal Irish Constabulary and to procure the re-establishment of that local police which would follow blindly their instructions in carrying out the wishes of the Protestant majority in Belfast. I say there is no town in the world where you have such a combination of forces against the police as in the town of Belfast, and it is easy to understand how they gave you such verdicts as they returned lately. You had these men—you had the Coroner, you had the Town Council, and three Members of Parliament discouraging the police, degrading the police, and pandering to the mob, using every expedient to embarrass the Government and to defeat the measures taken for the restoration of peace. Given such a state of things as this, the riots in Belfast in June, July, and August, so far from being a matter of surprise, will be seen to be a matter of course. I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether it is not a fact that there are many things on the surface of these riots which explain their origin — whether every public-house owned by a Catholic in the Protestant quarter of Belfast was wrecked but one, and whether many Catholic residents in the Protestant quarter have been forced by violence and threats to give up their homes and go to other parts of the town? I ask him also where one case has been cited of a Protestant house in a Catholic district having been attacked and wrecked or the compulsion of a Protestant to leave a Catholic district? Has anything of that kind occurred within these months? Now, what is the Government going to do? I think the first duty of the Government is to restore order. The late Government were defeated at the Election. The policy of Home Rule is for the moment defeated. A grave responsibility rests on the Government. Many men, many hundreds of men, are wounded, and some are maimed for life; and I think, in the language of the Mayor of Belfast, the time is come when the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer may feel it to be his duty to do what he can to undo some of the mischief he has done. If he cannot do that he might make some effort to mitigate the consequences of his reckless language. I ask him if the Government has made any searches for arms? The people of Belfast were directed by Proclamation last month to give up any arms in their possession. Since then there has been wholesale firing, there have been fusilades maintained all night on two occasions in certain parts of the town, and it is suspected that this firing was maintained by the ammunition of the Government and of the Queen. There are rifle clubs in the town which can obtain supplies of ammunition from the stores of the Queen at the request of their secretaries, and there is no security taken by the Government for the use to which the ammunition should be put or the hands in which the weapons are kept. I think if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) can spare another 24 hours in the study of the affairs of Ireland, or to devote to an excursion to Ireland, he will find something to do in Belfast. Is the Proclamation to give up arms to remain a dead letter? Are the persons ordered to give up arms to be allowed to keep them if they like, or will the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant undertake to have a search made for arms in Belfast, and particularly in that quarter where the use or misuse of arms was carried on freely? Will he place in Belfast when the labours of the Commission are concluded a large permanent force, and will he place that force under the command of the local magistrates? Will he place there a man who takes an intelligent view of the work of maintaining public order and who will act upon that view? Will he place the police force under an officer who can realize that the disturbances are due to the attempts of the non-Catholic mobs to enter the Catholic districts? Will he deprive the local magistrates of all share in the command of the police or in their direction? Will he confide the control of public forces in the streets for the maintenance of public order to magistrates responsible to the Government? These are questions to which we would like an answer. It is notorious that the conduct of the local magistrates in the streets of Belfast procured a continuance of these riots by causing police officers on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of June to withdraw the police from the presence of the mob. They caused the police to be sent into their barracks, and they induced the mob to regard themselves as safe from the police. This gave a licence to the rioters. The magistrates of the town of Belfast who pursued this course embarrassed the resident magistrates who were in the town, and in their council room they did all they could to encourage the idea that the Constabulary of Ireland was a force not fit to be employed in the preservation of the peace of the town. What can be more horrible than the language used in the streets of Belfast by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, who asked the citizens to form committees to get information about the police and to bring it to him, and he would take care it was used in the right way? He said—

> "There are men in the ranks of the Constabulary who are conspirators and who belong to the Invincible Organization."

This is the language used by a Member of this House. If it be true, why did he keep this knowledge in his mind so long? Why did he keep it until now? If it be false, what punishment that this House, or the laws of the land can pass, is adequate to his offence? Sir, on this statement, which has been in no way prolonged, and which has been listened to by the House with an attention I gratefully acknowledge, I have no intention of imputing the origin of the growth of these disturbances to either as a body the Orangemen or the Protestants of Belfast. I do, however, impute them to the advice and the incitements of politicians. If these incitements are renewed the riots will be renewed. If these are not renewed we will hear no more of the riots. The reason why I have not mentioned the name of Protestants or Orangemen in connection with these riots is that I know that there are multitudes of Protestants in Ireland and in this country who look with horror on these detestable riots, and I am willing to believe that there are many Orangemen by whom any resort to these outpourings of civil hate or disturbance would not be countenanced. Sir, I have upon this occasion pursued my object in a public spirit. I think I have pursued it in good faith, and I am confident that most of what I have said, if not all of it, will be adopted by most of the Protestants, and even, I should think, by the great body of the Orangemen of Belfast.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words—"And humbly tore present to Her Majesty that certain circumstances accountable for the recent outbreak, prolongation, and repeated renewals of riots, raids for plunder, and conflicts with the Forces of the Crown, in Belfast, dictate the necessity for the prompt adoption of special measures for the maintenance of social order there, and that the most imperative and urgent of these measures are, the re-establishment of Her Majesty's authority in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters, the limitation of all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown, in times of public emergency, and adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, to magistrates directly responsible to Her Majesty's Government, and the increase of the local Constabulary Force to such a strength as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency, until Parliament, on consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, can proceed to the application of adequate permanent measures for the protection of life and property in certain quarters of Belfast."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): A large part of the speech of the hon. Member has been taken up by subjects with which I am perfectly ready to admit that the Commission which it is proposed to issue cannot deal. The hon. Member has made very strong charges against my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham for having, by their speeches in the past, promoted the unhappy disturbances in Belfast. I leave it to anyone, looking at the terms of the Motion, whether he would have anticipated that the hon. Member would have devoted so large a portion of his speech to that subject. Those speeches were made a long time ago. [*Ironical cheers.*] I am merely stating a fact as to the speech of my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Belfast, which the hon. Member went through almost sentence by sentence. ["No!"] Well, a very large part of it. He throughout his remarks placed on that speech interpretations and drew inferences which I think were in no respect justified. That speech was made so long ago as February last, and in April the hon. Gentleman placed on the Paper a Notice of censure upon my noble Friend for what he had said. My noble Friend directly challenged him to bring that Notice to the test a division, but the hon. Gentleman never accepted that challenge.

MR. SEXTON said, he had several times placed the Notice on the Paper and used every effort to bring it on, but the course of Public Business, beyond his control, absolutely prevented it.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: If hon. Gentlemen opposite really desire to have a subject debated they are perfectly well able to secure it. The hon. Gentleman does great injustice to his own powers by attempting the excuse which he has just put forward. No, Sir, that challenge was given by my noble Friend, and yet that

Motion never was brought forward in this House. At a later date the subject was alluded to on the third reading of the Arms Bill of the late Government, and my noble Friend made a speech in which he plainly stated his position and opinions with reference to this matter. That speech was criticized in his absence by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and, if I remember aright, there was a subsequent correspondence on the subject. Yet even then the hon. Member never took courage to challenge a Vote of the House upon those charges which he has reiterated to-day against my noble Friend. I deny there is any fair ground whatever for those charges, for the inferences which have been unfairly drawn, and for the interpretation placed on the speech of my noble Friend. I deny that in the action which my noble Friend took there was anything on account of which it would be fair in any degree to charge him with having incited these unhappy disturbances in Belfast. My noble Friend appears to have thought, as a good many others did, that it was necessary and right that those who on this side of the Irish Channel were favourable to the maintenance of the Union should make their determination clearly known to the loyal population in the North of Ireland, and should show them that they were not to be left deserted and betrayed to those whom they considered their enemies. That was what my noble Friend told the people of Belfast. I say he was justified in taking that course, and that the charges which the hon. Member has made against him, ought to have been made, not incidentally on a Motion which apparently has no reference whatever to them in any shape, but on a Motion directly challenging the judgment of the House.

Mr. SEXTON: The speeches have borne fruit since.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: If that is the opinion of the hon. Member, why did he not put a Motion of Censure on my noble Friend on the Paper? If he really believes what he now says, why does he put this vague and purposeless Motion, instead? He has not the courage of his convictions. He can make charges, but he does not bring them to the test of proof. I am not going to dwell further on that point. In endeavouring to deal with the statement of the hon. Gentleman on other matters I feel myself in no small difficulty. I confess that, having the responsibility of endeavouring to restore order in Belfast, I feel that my work will be materially increased by much that he has said, and still more by the debate which I fear must follow this Motion. Whatever opinions hon. Members may entertain, I earnestly implore them, as far as possible, to refrain from anything that may provoke or maintain those unfortunate feelings which have prevailed in Belfast. The hon. Member has told the House that these riots were conceived by persons in authority, and were generated and prosecuted in the interests of the present Government. That may be his view; but there is a directly opposite view which is as absolutely unfounded. There is the view, I am sorry to say widely entertained, even by persons in respectable positions among the Protestants of Belfast, that the action that was taken by the late Government with reference to these riots was directly aimed at their liberties and rights, and that they were, in fact, the victims of what I may almost call a conspiracy as base as that to which the hon. Member has referred. I believe that these charges on either side are equally devoid of truth. I believe the charge against the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. John Morley), of flooding Belfast with Catholic Constabulary from the South of Ireland in order to put down the loyal population of Belfast, is as far from the truth as the charge the hon. Member has made against the noble Lord. I would earnestly deprecate the expression of this kind of opinion as calculated to do infinite mischief in Belfast, far greater mischief than hon. Members can be aware of. That is not my only difficulty. In accordance with the action of our Predecessors and the general desire, Her Majesty's Government has issued a Commission of Judicial Inquiry. Let me read to the House the terms of that inquiry. They are—

> "To inquire into the origin and circumstances of the said riots and disturbances and the cause of their continuance, the existing local arrangements for the preservation of the peace of the

town of Belfast, the magisterial jurisdiction exercised within it, and the amount and constitution and efficiency of the police force usually available there, and the proceedings and action taken by the magistrates, stipendiary and local, and other authorities and the police force, on the occasion of the said riots and disturbances; whether these authorities and the existing police forces are adequate for the future maintenance of order and tranquillity within the town; and whether any and what steps ought to be taken, and whether any and what changes ought to be made in the local magisterial and police jurisdiction arrangements and establishments, with a view to the better preservation of the public peace and the prevention and prompt suppression of riot and disorder."

Well, Sir, it seems to me it would be impossible to frame the terms of an inquiry which should be more complete and searching into all the points which the hon. Member has brought before the House. If I were to express an opinion here and now upon the conduct of the magistrates, the conduct of the police, or the arrangements present, past, or future, for maintaining order in Belfast, and if that opinion were to have weight with the Commissioners—as I am sure it would not—it would be making their inquiry a farce. It is for the Commission judicially to ascertain the facts under the powers which I hope Parliament will confer upon them. It is for them to give their opinion on the points submitted to them, and it will be for myself, or whoever may be representing the Government of Ireland when that Report is made, to consider what should be done in consequence of the Report of the Commission? How can I express any opinion on that subject now? Therefore, Sir, the hon. Gentleman in the statements which he has made to the House, so far as they affect local circumstances or persons in Belfast, has brought forward a subject with which it is quite impossible and would be wrong for me to attempt to deal on the part of the Government. Now, he has stated that in his opinion this Motion will not interfere with the inquiry by this Commission, and he brought forward two points in support of that statement. In the first place, he said that he blamed the present Government very much for the removal of the police from what is called the Shankhill Road district. He stated that the police had been removed from the Shankhill Road district on the 9th of August, and that this, of course, was a great blow at the authority of the Constabulary in Belfast. Now, I will endeavour to place before the House precisely what happened in this matter. I was sworn in as Chief Secretary on the 5th of August. My first step was to place myself in communication with the gentleman in Belfast who appeared to me to be constitutionally the proper person for the Irish Government to communicate with on this subject. I thought that the Mayor and the local magistrates of Belfast had not been consulted in this matter by my Predecessors as they ought to have been. And here I would like to say that, in my mind, not only are all the charges which the hon. Gentleman has made against Sir Edward Harland absolutely without foundation, but that the whole population of Belfast, Catholics as well as Protestants, owe a great debt of gratitude to Sir Edward Harland for his able and efficient conduct as Mayor of the town at this trying time. I telegraphed to Sir Edward Harland asking him to see me, in order to place me in possession of the views entertained by the local magistrates in the matter. I saw him on the 6th. On that very day the change was made in regard to the position of the Constabulary in the Shankhill Road to which the hon. Gentleman has alluded. It could not have been made by Sir Edward Harland, as he was then in Dublin; it was made by those who were then in charge of the force on the spot, the magistrates—I believe mainly the Resident Magistrates—in concert with the General commanding the Forces, and, I think, to no small extent at his instance. Well, now, I do not wish to express an opinion as to whether that action was right or wrong at the time. It was done absolutely without the cognizance of the Government; it was, indeed, not until a few days afterwards that I found it had been done. I confess I regretted it; but I do not wish to attribute the smallest blame to anybody for action taken under very difficult circumstances. Our duty was, as soon as we could, to endeavour gradually and carefully to restore the authority of the police in the Shankhill Road, from which they had been temporarily removed. The hon. Gentleman has referred to a Proclamation of Sir Edward Harland on this very subject, under which arrangements are to be made for the recommencement of duty by the police in the Shankhill Road on this very day. Therefore, I think I have answered the question of the hon. Member on this point. The hon. Member went on to blame the Government because, as he says, the employers of Belfast do not employ Catholic workmen; and yet, even while saying that, he suggested that in retaliation the Catholics in other parts of Ireland are going to "Boycott" Belfast manufactures. It is not my business to interfere between the employers of Belfast and the persons they may choose to employ; but I am pretty well certain, knowing what I do of the capacity for business of the employers, that they are not likely to deprive themselves of the services of capable and skilled workmen on account of their religion. Whatever may have occurred for a short time owing to the outrage upon Catholic workmen to which the hon. Member has alluded, I do not believe that there is any extended relinquishment of work on part of Roman Catholics, or that there is any real ground for the allegation of partiality made against employers by the hon. Member. But the hon. Member told the House that he desired in this matter to compel those in authority to bear the responsibility of their actions. That is precisely what we desire in this and in every other case, and I welcome the hon. Gentleman as an ally in that part of the work of government in Ireland. He went on to various local matters connected with the origin of these riots, of the oppression of Catholics by Protestants in certain yards, of the death of a Roman Catholic boy—[A Home Rule MEMBER: Murder.]—and of the attack on a Sunday school. In regard to one, at any rate, and the most important of these three events, the hon. Member said that in his belief it was not due to either religious or political feeling. Very well, I am very glad to obtain that testimony from the hon. Gentleman, because I thought from the larger part of his speech he was of opinion that every one of these unfortunate occurrences was due to political or religious feeling.

MR. SEXTON: I was speaking of the occurrence of the 3rd of June, and I said that it had been misrepresented locally to have arisen from the threat that Protestants would not be employed. I find that is not so.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: At any rate, these are precisely the matters which will be properly inquired into, and can only be properly inquired into, by the Commission; and I do not understand what object he proposed to himself by bringing them to-day under the notice of the House of Commons. The hon. Gentleman, in speaking of Sir Edward Harland, referred to some negligence on the part of the heads of the firm of which he is a member in allowing workmen in their employ to obtain hundreds of thousands of iron nuts for the purpose of assailing the Catholics. I really cannot tell what are the exact circumstances in this matter; but any hon. Member can, if he likes, satisfy himself that it is hardly possible these iron nuts can have been used to anything like the extent alleged by the hon. Member. If hon. Members will look for themselves at a very interesting surgical report which appeared in *The Times* of yesterday—[*Cries of* "Oh!"] Well, of course, it is open to hon. Members to question the accuracy of the report; but, as far as I can see, there is nothing whatever of political or religious bias in the writer's mind, and it appears to me to be a purely matter-of-fact report as to the nature of the wounds which he and others treated in hospitals. Hon. Members will find in that report statements from which it appears that hardly any of the wounds, if any, could, in the opinion of the writer, have been inflicted by missiles of the kind. And although, of course, it does not follow that no use was made of such missiles, yet I think it does cast considerable doubt upon the extent of the use of those missiles which the hon. Member has represented. The hon. Member for West Belfast, in the terms of his Motion, and in a less extent perhaps in his speech, strongly protests, as it seems to me, against anything that can be called local government in Belfast. In his speech he alluded to the action of the local magistracy. He actually charged them, although intrusted with the preservation of the peace of Belfast, with having fomented the riots in that town. [*Irish Home Rule cheers.*] He charged them with having interfered with the efficient discharge of their duty by the Constabulary. [*Cheers.*] He said that the Coroner of Belfast embarrassed the operations of the law. [*Renewed* *cheers.*] But does it not occur to hon. Members who cheer those statements that those charges, if true, throw a very considerable difficulty in the way of allowing to the town of Belfast even its existing powers of local government? They appear to me to object to the Mayor and the Corporation, the magistrates, the Coroner, and all the present institutions for local self-government in Belfast. And yet the hon. Member considers that those occurrences, painted in the light in which he has pictured them, afford no argument against Home Rule. Of course, I do not want to argue that question now; but I confess that for hon. Members who put in the forefront of their creed that Irishmen should be permitted to govern themselves both as a nation and locally, without interference from what is known as "the Castle," it is a very singular request to make that the local magistracy in the most important commercial town in Ireland should be entirely extinguished; that all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown in times of public emergency, and of adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, should be conferred upon magistrates directly responsible to the Government—namely, the Castle officials. I would like to see how hon. Members who pursue this debate reconcile their position in this matter with their general opinions as to local government for the whole of Ireland. With reference to two questions put by the hon. Member for Belfast, I should like to repeat what has already been said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the Constabulary. I think the Royal Irish Constabulary, in performing the difficult and harassing and dangerous duty of endeavouring to maintain public order in Belfast, have, as a force, done their work in an admirable manner. Of course, there may have been instances in which there has been a want of judgment, or, perhaps, of discipline. These, however, are points which will be investigated by the Commission; but, speaking generally, I think it has been wrong that either side in Belfast should have felt suspicion against the Constabulary, or that any person holding a prominent position in that town should have directed abuse against them. The hon. Gentleman asked me whom we were going to place in command of the Constabulary in Belfast pending the completion of this inquiry? I should like, in passing, to say that since I sent the Inspector General of Constabulary to Belfast to re-unite a very divided authority we have reaped the greatest benefit from his action, from the tact he has displayed, and from the judgment and common sense which he has infused into the management of affairs. I wish to express, on the part of the Government, our obligation to the Inspector General for the manner in which he has performed his work. Of course, he cannot remain there long. Practically, he will not remain beyond the time when the police have been restored to their complete duty on the Shankhill Road. Then we shall endeavour to select some efficient officer who will take charge of the force, and will be able to control them judiciously and properly pending the consideration of the Report of the Commission.

MR. SEXTON: Will you establish a station on Queen's Island?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: That is a detail upon which it is impossible to express an opinion to-day. Any arrangement, however, would be considered which would tend to maintain order. The hon. Member referred to the question of searching for arms. I must admit that the proclamation of Belfast has not been so successful as I suppose it was expected to be. That has arisen from a defect in the law. It is impossible under the law to make search for arms unless there is reason to suspect that arms are concealed in an individual house. That, I think, was a Proviso of the Act of last Session. I cannot say at this moment how far the Proclamation has been effective; but I am expecting very shortly to obtain a Report upon the matter. I need not say that we shall have then very seriously to consider how far the law is defective, and in what way it ought to be amended. I have attempted to fulfil my promise to steer clear between what I think would be the grave error of expressing any opinion as to the circumstances of those riots; and, on the other hand, to convey such information to the House as to the position of affairs, or as to the action of the Government, as I think the House would be fully entitled to receive. I would only conclude by saying that I cannot conceive anything, to whomsoever blame is due, which could inflict a graver disgrace on a prosperous and intelligent community like Belfast than the continuance or recrudescence of those riots. And I would most earnestly entreat any hon. Member who may think it necessary to prolong the debate to recollect what I have said as to the danger of exciting those unhappy feelings to which the riots are due, and to keep as far as possible within the bounds of moderation, which will be of the greatest assistance to Her Majesty's Government in the responsible and difficult task which they have in hand.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said, he was one of those Members who felt very strongly that no real good could arise from the discussion of this question in the House of Commons. Of all tribunals in the world it seemed to him that the House of Commons was the least fitted to try the issue raised by the Belfast disturbances, inasmuch as some hon. Members would hear only the charges made without hearing the defence, whereas others would hear the defence only without hearing the charges. He regretted that the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) and hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway had not chosen to await the Report of the Royal Commission, but had determined to submit their version of the facts to the House. It was, therefore, incumbent upon those like himself, who believed that there were two sides to this story, as to most stories, not to allow public opinion to be prejudiced before the Commission reported. Perhaps he had better say that he was not an Orangeman, and that until the Irish policy of the late Prime Minister united Liberals and Conservatives in Ireland his political action was entirely in opposition to that pursued by the Orange or extreme Protestant Party. In fact, during his recent election campaign one of the chief amusements of hon. Members below the Gangway was in the unearthing of all his opposition to Orangemen during the last 25 years. And, if he was not an Orangeman, neither had he any local connection in Belfast to warp his judgment. He had simply gone to the town to inquire into the facts for himself. He had consulted clergymen, merchants, and others living in the town who had been eye-witnesses of most of the deplorable occurrences, and he had tried, by collecting evidence from perfectly unprejudiced sources, to arrive at something like the truth of the case, and this was his warrant, and his only warrant, for troubling the House. To understand the recent outbreak the House must first of all remember that the disturbances were spread over three distinct periods, each of them separated from the other by a considerable length of time. First came the June riots, commencing on the 3rd and ending on the 10th of that month. Peace was maintained until the second period of disturbance, which commenced on the 12th of July, and closed on the 13th. The third and most important of the struggles commenced on the 31st of July, and only terminated on the 15th of August. The first point to be determined was, what was the origin of the riots? The case which had been attempted to be established by the hon. Member for West Belfast was that the Orange or Protestant Party in the town had invariably been the aggressors, and that the Catholics had acted throughout in their own defence, while the local magistrates had shown an utter want of capacity and the most shameless Party spirit. He did not believe the statement of the hon. Member, because its correctness was disproved by evidence upon which he placed the greatest reliance. The first disorder arose out of an attack made on the 3rd of June by two Nationalists, or Catholics, named Murphy, upon a Protestant workman named Blakeley, at the Queen's Island. The Home Rule proposals of the late Government were then before Parliament, and feeling ran high all over Ireland. It ran exceptionally high in Belfast. The two Murphys told Blakeley that when the Home Rule Bill passed all his sort would be cleared out of Ireland. Addressed as they were to fiery politicians, and in the midst of that excited community, these were just the words necessary to kindle the flame. Blakeley having retorted in the same vein, he was savagely beaten by the Murphys, and the next day serious trouble commenced. The incident on the Island was talked over throughout Belfast, and on the 4th of June a body of riveters employed on the Island, estimated at 300 by the people of Belfast, but at from 500 to 2,000 by the hon. Member for West Belfast, sallied out and chased a body of Catholic navvies who were at work at the Alexandra Dock. The navvies fled, and some of them took refuge on a raft—amongst them the young lad Curran, to whom reference had been made. The raft capsized. Curran fell into the water, and was drowned. Not one of the riveters was near Curran when this accidental circumstance occurred. Just as he blamed the Murphys for their senseless attack upon Blakeley, so he blamed the highly reprehensible conduct of this battalion of Protestant riveters who made the attack upon the Alexandra Dock navvies. He had no sympathy with lawlessness, whether it was in County Antrim or County Kerry. He, however, wished that some of the indignation which had been expressed by the hon. Member for West Belfast at the conduct of the Protestant riveters upon this occasion had been spared for the outrages which had occurred in other parts of the country. The death of Curran rose out of the lawless action of the riveters, and they were largely responsible for the occurrences that followed. Curran's funeral took place on Sunday, June 6, and was made the occasion of a great political demonstration. The men attending the funeral cheered for Home Rule, cursed the Queen, and many of them had sticks and stones in their hands. A breach of the peace was only prevented with the greatest difficulty; indeed, later on in the day, and after the funeral was over, an attack was made, not by a Protestant mob, but by a mob of another character, on a mill in which the workers were mainly Protestants, although, it being Sunday, there was not a man within its walls. On Tuesday, June 8, business commenced in deadly earnest. The Protestants assembled to celebrate the defeat of the Government of Ireland Bill in the House of Commons. Bonfires were lighted in the Protestant districts, and great jubilation prevailed. This the Catholics resented. Shots were fired at the Protestant demonstrators from a public-house kept by a Catholic named Mrs. O'Haire on the Shankhill Road. This produced violent feeling. The house was attacked. A Protestant named Morrison was wounded by a nephew of Mrs. O'Haire; and on the following day came the action on the part of the police, which, explained however it might be, would always be held as the beginning of the unfortunate feeling towards them on the part of a large section of the population of Belfast, which every right-minded man must deplore. At half-past 5 o'clock on the evening of that day about 1,500 men and boys, who were leaving their work at Coombe's foundry, were mistaken by the police, who were strangers to Belfast, for a riotous mob. The police charged them and drove them back, striking those who resisted on the head with their batons. He made no charge against the police with regard to this matter, their conduct on the occasion being now under investigation by a proper tribunal.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) rose to Order, and asked whether it was not against the Rules of the House for an hon. Member to read his speech?

MR. SPEAKER: It is contrary to the Rules of the House for a Member to read his speech; but he may refer to his notes to refresh his memory.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said, that was exactly what he was doing. If the charges of malice, Party spirit, and drunkenness which had been made against the Royal Irish Constabulary were substantiated before a proper tribunal it would be impossible to screen them in the matter, and no one would have any desire to do so. He was willing to admit that in this case a mistake was made by the Protestant party on the Shankhill Road. With their feelings influenced already, they felt that the Constabulary, by attacking Coombe's men, were siding with their opponents, and the most serious rioting at once took place, in the course of which O'Haire's house was wrecked and burnt, the "Corner Boys," perhaps, not being unwilling to join in where a liquor shop was to be looted; and the police, 110 strong and well armed, were driven back into their barracks. When the police were safe in their barracks they fired upon the rioters. The officer in charge—District Inspector Green—swore at the Coroner's inquest that he did his best to restrain the men; that he did not see any necessity to fire; and that he almost went on his knees to entreat them not to fire. He candidly admitted he was unable to restrain his men. As a matter of fact, seven people were killed that evening, including a barmaid, who was shot dead whilst sitting at the two-storey window of the house opposite the police barracks. [*A laugh.*] If a peasant in Kerry were shot the hon. Member for Kerry expressed his indignation in the loudest manner; but when an inoffensive barmaid, who was a Catholic, was shot the incident appeared to amuse the hon. Member.

Mr. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) said, that he was laughing, not at the incident, but at the phraseology of the hon. Member, who had spoken of a "two-storey window."

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL remarked that it would complete the ghastly character of the incident to mention that at the time of the occurrence another riot was taking place in another part of Belfast in which 40 houses of Protestants were wrecked. On June 10 the police, in firing in York Street, wounded 40 people, and with that circumstance the first period of the rioting came to a close. This deadly business simply arose out of a want of toleration on the part of the residuum on both sides. Catholics were buoyed up with the belief that Home Rule was at hand, and when their idol was shattered and broken they could stand it no longer, and they burst out in the way he had said. They claimed and exercised the right to light bonfires on the occasion of Mr. Sexton's triumph. They refused to allow the Protestants the same liberty when the Home Rule Bill was rejected. The second outburst of rioting commenced on the 12th of July, and it was brought about by the publication in *The Belfast Morning News* of an incendiary article informing Catholics that St. Peter's Catholic Church would be attacked. There was not a word of truth in that article, and the only attack made was by the Catholics upon an Orange band, which was proceeding to take part in the opening of an Orange hall. In the encounter on the 12th of July a private soldier and a head constable were shot by Protestant rioters. Here there was no doubt whatever as to the Party at fault. The hon. Member for West Belfast pointed out that these riots took place only where the Catholics were in a minority. If, however, the Protestant minority in Dublin were as pugnacious as the Catholic minority in Belfast there would be riots in Dublin every week. As long as the law of the land allowed bands in Dublin and Cork to march through the streets carrying any flag in the world but that of Great Britain, and playing any but loyal tunes, and took no note of the Protestant minority who were offended at these things, it was not possible for that House to put down Protestant bands and processions in Belfast, when the only offences were the carrying of the Union Jack and the playing of "Rule Britannia." Well, the second attack at Belfast was due to the attack made on the band in Grosvenor Street and to the article in *The Belfast Morning News.* A third outbreak, and the most serious, lasting from the 31st of July to the 15th of August, was due to a very simple series of facts. It was the habit of the ministers of the churches in Belfast to take the children attending their Sunday schools into the country. On Saturday, the 31st of July, the annual excursion of the children of St. Enoch's Church was timed to come. Owing to the disturbed state of the town, Dr. Hanna, the minister of that church, had postponed the excursion for three weeks at the request of the authorities. It had always been the habit of these children to walk through Belfast in procession with bands of music and banners. At the request of the authorities, however, Dr. Hanna resolved not to have any such display on the 31st of July. Yet this was the man who had been described to-day as fomenting riots. Well, the children enjoyed their day in the country, and were met at the railway station by their friends and relatives. The children and the teachers went home without falling into procession. Two bands had accompanied them on the excursion. One of them got safely off; but after the children had disappeared some persons obliged the second band to play. A savage attack was made upon this band in a Catholic district called Carrick Hill. From that day forward rioting of a serious character went on. Indeed, from the 31st of July to the 15th of August Belfast might be said to be practically in a state of siege. On one occasion the police took refuge in a public-house (M'Kenna's), and fired upon the people in a way that he hoped they would be able to defend before the Royal Commission. He believed that it would be found that the Islandmen incident roused bad feeling; that the attack on the navvies at the Alexandra Dock precipitated matters; and that the mistake of the police with regard to the foundrymen brought things to a crisis. That being so, he desired to say a few words as to the police and the local magistrates. In regard to the police it would be idle to attempt to conceal the feelings which existed in Belfast among all classes of Protestants. He was not able to join in any general laudation of the Royal Irish Constabulary as a Police Force. That they were a respectable body of men went without saying, and nobody would deny that they had performed eminent services to the State. But as a Police Force they were a conspicuous failure. They had none of the instincts of policemen, but all the instincts of a military force. He believed that 500 men of the Dublin Metropolitan Police armed simply with their batons would have made an end of these Belfast disturbances. The grave charges against the police must be thoroughly probed by the Royal Commission. But, after all, constables were simply men; and if they brought hundreds or thousands of them into a big town like Belfast, and made no accommodation for them, took no trouble to provide them with food, and they had the free run of the public-houses, they would have no doubt that a policeman with a rifle in his hand, under such circumstances, was a most dangerous animal to let loose on society. The House should also remember that they had lived through 12 months of grave political excitement. Their minds had been impressed with the idea that they were about to change their masters. Rightly or wrongly, they saw in the advent to power of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) the beginning of the end, and he had not the slightest doubt that many of these men believed a change was at hand. With this 12 months' experience some of these men might be excused if they lost their heads; but they would recover them now, and were likely to find on which side their bread was buttered. What was the charge made against the local magistrates? It was that they had been actuated by Party spirit, and had fomented the riots. He appealed to those Members around him who were engaged in commerce whether they could conceive that a body of men largely engaged in commerce in the town, and in manufactures, deliberately fomented disturbances which would retard that commerce and practically ruin it? Such a suggestion carried its own condemnation. He believed that when the whole details came out it would be found that they were trying honestly and strictly to do their duty. They might have made mistakes. He believed they had, but it was not everybody who could keep his head in a row. Hon. Members below the Gangway could not. It would not be possible to sustain the charge before the Royal Commission. He would like to caution the House as to some statements that had been made. The hon. Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) had said with regard to a recent trial that the jury was composed entirely of Orangemen. He happened to know, as a fact, that there was not a single Orangeman on it. There was one Catholic upon it. When the cause of the riots was fully investigated, the House would find that neither respectable Orangemen nor respectable Catholics had had anything to do with them. They would find that the riots were due to the residuum of Belfast. When he heard charges made against the Orangemen—not being an Orangeman himself—he could say that when they came to fight they would fight in another way. The Orangemen of Ulster and Belfast did not make up the noble army of cattle-maimers and "Moonlighters." Even the Belfast "Corner Boys" had proved unmistakably that they could stand like men in front of an armed Constabulary; they did not hide behind hedges to fire at innocent, unarmed victims. The Belfast Orangemen did not make up the criminal classes, or the illiterate of their polling-booths. They were the skilled artizans of the town, who had nothing to do with the fighting except when they were attacked. The riots were got up by the residuum of the population, under the mistaken idea as to the action of the police. As the debate had served the purpose of an attack upon the noble Lord the Leader of the House, he might draw this conclusion as to the connection between the two, and say to those hon. Members who had ridiculed and scorned the idea of

Orangemen fighting under any circumstances—that perhaps the "Corner Boys" of Belfast had been anxious to demonstrate the fact that they could do so if occasion arose.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said, they had just listened to the speech of a Gentleman who started in life by abusing the Orangemen, and who now, in order to be able to crawl into that House, had turned his coat and displayed the new-born zeal of a recent convert. The hon. Member was standing as an out-and-out Gladstonite within the year, and now he stood up in that House as an apologist of the Tory Government. He did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman into the details of a speech in which he had merely conveyed to the House in a loud voice documents which were published in *The Times* the other day signed by Mr. Patten as the paid agent of the Orangemen of Belfast. There were but two observations in the utterance worth notice. Glowing references had been made to the valour of the "Corner Boys" of Belfast. He would not enter into the questionable moral of such an interpretation of Orange rowdyism; but he would put before them one reason why such valour against the police was displayed. A bitter experience of privileges had deceived the Orangemen. They had been led by a long and bitter experience to believe that the Orange personality was far too sacred to be fired upon; that it was their privilege to stone the police; and that it was the duty of the magistrates of Belfast to order the police to retire before the rioters. He was glad to know that although this system had been carried on to an extent which had perpetuated the riots and disgraced the administration of justice in Belfast, the "Corner Boys" had received a lesson which might make them less valorous on future occasions. The result, however, had been that the Press of this country had been deluged with expressions of fiery indignation because the police dared to defend their lives, and to reply with their batons or rifles to the paving stones which were hurled at them. The hon. Member had quoted the evidence of Inspector Green, but omitted that portion of it in which the witness reluctantly said he believed the lives of the police were in imminent danger when they fired. Afterwards it turned out that Green had been more than once censured by his superiors for refusing to fire on Protestant mobs when the police were in imminent danger of their lives. If justice had been done, he would have been dismissed from the force as being a sympathizer with the Orangemen. The hon. Member had drawn a comparison between that somewhat mixed person the Protestant farmer, "Corner Boy" rowdies of Belfast, and the cattle maimers and Moonlighters of Kerry. He would remark that this was a comparison between wanton shooting from behind a stone wall and the shooting of the miserable peasant from behind a ditch in an open field. With reference to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he was willing to admit that if a conciliatory manner and a frank and gentlemanly demeanour could remove the difficulties in the way of governing Ireland and of dealing with the Irish Representatives in that House, the present Chief Secretary would be the man to do it; but the difficulties were of such a character that conciliatory manners and silken remedies would not be sufficient to remove them. The hon. Member for West Belfast had been twitted by the right hon. Gentleman for not proceeding with his proposed Motion of Censure against the Leader of the House on a former occasion; but he (Mr. Dillon), apart from the solid justification offered by the hon. Member himself, had to say that had that course been pursued the Chief Secretary must have known that, owing to the then condition of Parties, the discussion would have been comparatively fruitless. It had been the firm conviction of the Irish Members that the language used by the noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was of such a character that it would produce effects which would make them both regret they ever used it. The prophecies which he and his Friends made at the time, when they told the noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman that the Orangemen of Ulster could put but one interpretation on such language, had proved perfectly correct. The Chief Secretary had asked what could be done pending the result of the labours of the Commission by the opponents of the Government? Everyone knew that the Report of that Commission could not be practically acted upon for a very long time. In the meantime surely there were several questions of pressing urgency which required to be dealt with. First of all, there was the Shankhill Road district; secondly, the absence of means taken by the employers of labour in Belfast to prevent persecution within their works; thirdly, the conduct of the Mayor; and fourthly, and most important of all, the conduct of the borough magistrates. To none of these points, except perhaps the first, had the Chief Secretary given a satisfactory reply. Whenever the Government were dealing with the South of Ireland they did not wait for the Report of a Commission, but at once despatched a gallant officer to take over the administration; and he was entitled to ask that, pending the Report of the Commission, measures should be taken for protecting the Catholics in Belfast. When the Chief Secretary went to Ireland during the riots his action was prompt and, as far as it went, satisfactory. But the right hon. Gentleman had not mentioned that when he was in Dublin, and after he had sent down the head of the Constabulary to take charge of Belfast, he received a telegram from that official—of which he (Mr. Dillon) had a copy—to the effect that magistrates should instantly be sent who would not prevent the police from defending their lives in Belfast, and who were not acquainted with people in the town.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I cannot charge my memory with the precise words of the telegram, or whatever it may have been, that was sent to me by the Inspector General of Constabulary on his arrival in Belfast; and I do not understand how the hon. Member became possessed of a copy of it; but, so far as I can recollect it, the purport of the telegram was a request that more magistrates—military magistrates—should be sent down. I do not remember anything being said to the disparagement of the borough magistrates.

MR. DILLON (*amid cries of* "Read!" *from the Ministerial Benches*) said, he had read the telegram. [An hon. MEMBER: Where did he get it?] [An Irish MEMBER: What is that to you?] He got a copy of the telegram. He accepted fully any statement the Chief Secretary made; but, at the same time, he contended that the right hon. Gentleman's statement strongly bore out his version of the telegram. There were plenty of magistrates in Belfast, and it was perfectly manifest that they were not doing their duty, or it would not have been necessary to send down other magistrates, and military magistrates. The Chief Secretary had acknowledged in his speech—and a very remarkable admission it was—that the evacuation of the Shankhill Road district was carried out without consulting the Executive authority in Dublin, and without the knowledge of the Dublin Castle authority. A more extraordinary movement than that he could not conceive. It was even kept secret from the authorities of Dublin. The Chief Secretary said it was done by consent of the officers in command of the police at Belfast; but why was that consent given? The truth was that the Irish Constabulary in the North had been brought to the very verge of revolt, and that if this system had been carried further the Government would have been face to face with a revolt of the whole of the Irish Constabulary. The police officers gave their consent to the evacuation, because they knew that their men could not be trusted to allow themselves to be made targets for the paving-stones of Belfast without attempting to defend themselves. That pointed to a condition of things in which no Catholic could feel safe unless the Government placed in command of the police an officer who would have supreme control over them pending the permanent changes which were admitted on all hands to be necessary for the security of the town. Let the House contrast the kind of justice administered in the South of Ireland with that in the North. In the South of Ireland a special officer was sent down with special powers, and without any previous inquiry at all to put down "Moonlighters" and to protect the landlords, whereas there was no protection for the Catholic people of Belfast. If this conduct were continued they would confirm the feeling in Ireland that there was one justice in the North and another in the South. The Chief Secretary had referred to a certain surgical report made by a doctor sent down by the Loyal Patriotic Union, or some other society of that sort. That gentleman put his name to a statement that would not increase his reputation. He said he was of opinion that none of the wounds he examined could have been inflicted by missiles taken from the yard of the Mayor of Belfast. [The hon. Gentleman produced a box containing a number of iron bolts and other missiles which he said were picked up on the "battle field."] Resuming, he contended that they must have come from the yard of the Mayor. Some of the weapons were of a most deadly character, and in close quarters were more deadly than firearms. The Chief Secretary had referred to the fact of the Irish Party finding fault with Local Authorities. The House should bear in mind that the Corporation of Belfast was elected by 5,000 men, who were nearly all Protestants, out of a population of 225,000. Was it, then, to be wondered at that they objected to such local government, which was simply a mixture of Dublin Castle and Belfast Orangeism, and which resulted in a system of police which had been condemned by Royal Commission, and which placed itself at the disposal of the rioters? There was nothing which was more likely to increase the difficulties to which the Chief Secretary had alluded than the distinction between the administration of the law in Belfast and in other parts of the country. Some of the Belfast rioters who were arrested were taken red-handed by the police. They had kept up for hours a siege of the police barracks, a thing unheard of in this country and in the South of Ireland. What, he asked, would be done were these things done in Kerry? Well, some of these men, taken red-handed by the police in Belfast, were brought before a Belfast Bench of Magistrates, and what were the sentences? The sentences have been a parody of public justice, and were calculated to inflame the passions of the people. A sentence of 20*s.* fine or 10 days was passed for hunting the police off Belfast streets and besieging them in their barracks. They knew how differently crimes of a very moderate character were punishable in the South. He knew a man personally who was sentenced to five years' penal servitude for throwing stones at an old man from behind a hedge, and when no serious injury was inflicted. And he said that no man in that House and no man in England could stand up and say that they could expect from the people of Ireland confidence in the justice of English law when such cases of distinction in administration were seen. So long as such sentences as those in the Belfast cases continued they could not expect any other impression to be carried to the minds of the rioters of Belfast than that they were regarded with sympathy. The Chief Secretary ought to remove from the minds of the people of the North that there was one kind of justice for them and another for the men in Kerry. The fact had been alluded to that he had himself opposed the renewal of the Arms Act; but one of his chief reasons for doing so was the belief that it would not be used when it was most needed, and that it would not be administered impartially. That belief had been justified by the fact that firearms had been freely used in Belfast, although that town was in a proclaimed district. Those arms had been used, not only against Her Majesty's police, but also against Her Majesty's soldiers. Dr. Hanna and Dr. Kane had advised the Protestants not to give up a single rifle, and the Town Council of Belfast had described the Proclamation as insulting to the population of Belfast, and recommended the people to disobey it. Where there was one rifle in the South there were 10 in Ulster; and although the use made of them in the South was an improper one, it was insignificant in comparison to what was the case in Ulster. If this system was to continue, he did not envy the Chief Secretary his task. The Irish Party were watching with eager curiosity whether an honest attempt would be made to disarm the people of every district of Ulster which had been proclaimed. If they did not, the Government would lay themselves under the burden of the grievous charge that they were not attempting to do what they always pretended to do in Ireland, to sail on an even keel, but were making themselves the tool of an ascendancy. He wished to say one or two words now about the Rev. Hugh Hanna, who, so long as 20 years ago, had been before the public as a political firebrand and an exciter of sectarian hate. In the midst of the riots, when the streets of Belfast were dyed with blood, the Rev. H. Hanna preached a sermon in which he said that the riots were undoubtedly to be regretted, but they had served a useful purpose. He noticed that the leaders of the Orangemen, in speaking of the riots, adopted a double tone. They began by stating that no Orangemen had anything to do with them; but towards the conclusion of their speeches they said, "Let England beware. These riots have demonstrated what stuff is in the Orangemen of Ulster." But if the Orangemen had taken no part in the riots, how could the riots have demonstrated the stuff of which the Orangemen were made? The Rev. H. Hanna, in concluding his sermon, launched out into a denunciation of "Morley's murderers." Irish Members had often been taken to task for denunciation of the police; but he defied anyone to show that they had ever gone into a district where the police were being shot down, and made use of the most inflammatory language, calculated to excite mobs to continue to shoot down the police. The language of Irish Members was used in that House, and generally when the occurrences to which they referred were at an end. Had he or any of the Irish National Leaders used such language in similar circumstances they would have been placed in the dock. Had anything been done; had the Government even spoken in condemnation of the language of the Rev. H. Hanna? The Chief Secretary was bound to take notice of it in that House.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I referred to no individual. I did not think it necessary; but I distinctly and strongly condemned any such language.

MR. DILLON said, he had been placed on trial for language used by him, and he appealed to any Member of that House to say whether his language could be compared with that of the Rev. H. Hanna? Such difference of treatment destroyed all confidence in the impartiality of the Administration. The right hon. Gentleman had said in his speech, which contrasted so favourably in its tone with the speeches of other Members of the Government, that there was not the shadow of foundation for the charge that the original incentives to the riots were to be found in the speeches of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) and the letters of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain). The right hon. Gentleman must have made that statement in ignorance of the past history of Ireland. Any man who appealed to the Protestants of Ulster to show that they were men like their ancestors in 1798 could not use language more calculated to let loose the passions which desolated that Province at that unhappy time, and the consequences of which remained to this day. On the morrow of the battle of the Diamond a campaign of extermination was entered upon, which for cruelty, wholesale persecution, and ruthless savagery was unparalleled in the annals of civilization. Every Catholic in the county of Armagh was doomed to absolute extermination. They had it on the evidence of Viscount Gosport. Six thousand Catholic families were driven from their homes. The practice was to give notice to the unfortunate Catholics in this way—"To hell or Connaught, or you know your fate." ["Question!"] It was the question. He was pointing out the deeds these Orangemen were invited to repeat in order to demonstrate to the people of England that they were like their fathers in 1798. If after the warning the Catholics did not go, within 24 hours they had their houses burnt over their heads by the "Peep-o'-Day Boys." Those were acts which any humane man would wish to throw a veil over. It was the endeavour of the Irish Members to make the people of Ulster forget 1641 and 1798. While the Land League existed in that Province for five years there were no riots. But the result of the noble Lord's visit had been to revive memories which led to deeds similar to what had been done in past days. If liberty was to be denied to the people of Ireland on account of the Belfast riots, all he could say was that that was a position which no Government could long continue to maintain, because it amounted to saying that they looked forward to the perpetuation of hatred and Party struggle which had disgraced Ulster, and which it was the highest object of the lives of the Irish Members to put an end to.

MR. EWART (Belfast, N.) said, the hon. Member for West Belfast appeared in a new character that night. There could be no doubt—and hon. Members on both sides of the House must agree to it—that Ireland for years had been in a most deplorable state. The right hon. Gentleman opposite the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had recently described it as one "disgraced by midnight outrages and daylight assassinations," and referred to those murders of undefended women and noble men; and they had been told by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian that the "idea of a certain section of Irishmen was to march through rapine and murder to the dismemberment of the Empire." In late years the state of Ireland had been worse than ever. They had the institution of "Boycotting" prevailing throughout the land. It was a horrible system, inaugurated by the hon. Member for Cork in a well-known speech, in which he advised his countrymen to shun those with whom they disagreed in the market, to shun them in the street, and to shun them in the chapel, and it prevented him from exercising his individual liberty. In addition to that miserable and wretched system prevailing in Ireland they had the horrible system of the maiming of cattle. He had been an admirer of the speeches of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton); but during the whole time that he had listened to or read them he had never heard one word in condemnation of the dreadful state of affairs that had so long existed. Now, however, when the people of the North of Ireland were provoked into acts which he would not defend, the hon. Member came out as the apostle of peace and order. He only hoped that the reformation of the hon. Gentleman would continue, and that he would use even greater efforts in the cause of law and order. He (Mr. Ewart) hoped, also, that he would use his influence in the West of Ireland and other parts, and also with his Colleagues, in order to bring about a better state of things.

Mr. SEXTON: I have done it.

Mr. EWART said, he was glad to hear it. The hon. Member, however, in the very long speech that he had made, seemed to have been troubled with a singularly defective memory in reference to the Belfast riots. He was not sure that he did not go back as far as 1841, but he certainly went back to 1864 and 1867; and he led the House to suppose that what occurred at that time was an unprovoked ebullition on the part of the Protestants of Belfast. He (Mr. Ewart), however, begged to remind the House that, at the time the hon. Member referred to, the country was convulsed by an agitation for the Repeal of the Union. The people of Belfast were filled with apprehension; and the Daniel O'Connell Ceremony and the agitation for the Repeal of the Union, had caused intense excitement, and led to serious collisions. He was not going into any statement in defence of the recent riots in Belfast, nor did he wish to minimize them. He deplored them as much as any man could do. He regretted that a town noted for its loyalty on all occasions, and especially so on the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales to the North of Ireland a short time ago, should have injured its fair fame by the recent proceedings. However, although he could by no means defend those proceedings, he might recall to the House that the state of the public mind of Belfast was wrought up to a feverish state, and was in a most susceptible condition. He would not follow the example of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and go into what he considered the state of affairs with regard to the origin of the riots there. He bowed with all deference to the desire of the Chief Secretary, and recognized at once that that might be a subject of a contentious nature, and to be avoided in view of the judicial inquiry about to take place. His hon. Friend the Member for South Tyrone had given his version of the affair, in which he agreed in the main. He (Mr. Ewart) would not venture to say more than this—that the public mind was in a very excited state, and that there was very great agitation amongst all Parties. The excitement was due to the Home Rule debates, and to the threats of the Nationalist Party as to what would take place when the Bill came into operation. There had been a great deal of trouble caused by indiscreet people on both sides. He did not blame one side much more than the other. The statement of hon. Members, that 600 Catholic families had been discharged from their employment by Protestants, was greatly exaggerated. He (Mr. Ewart) did not believe that a single Roman Catholic was discharged, though numbers of them, as well as of Protestants, left their employment. He had heard complaints of that sort in connection with an interest with which he had something to do; but he was given to understand that there was nothing to prevent those people going back to their work. He was happy to say that most of them had gone back to their work, and he hoped would remain at it. Indeed, he believed it was a fact that the whole of the Catholics had returned to their work in the case referred to. Many Catholics had never left their work, and he trusted that there would be no further differences. With regard to the attack that had been made in that House upon Orangemen, he would remind hon. Members that the Orange Order fully recognized the principle of civil and religious liberty. He (Mr. Ewart) was not an Orangeman himself; but he asserted that civil and religious liberty was the leading principle of the Orange Body. They had fought for that great principle in Ireland; they succeeded in establishing the principle, and they were determined to maintain it. It was not the conduct of Orangemen that was at the root of all this evil in Belfast. It was the dislike of a certain portion of the community to all loyalty. The hon. Gentleman had stated that this was not a religious question; he was glad to hear him say so, for it was not really a question of religion, but a question of loyalty. Protestants fully recognized the right of their Catholic countrymen to religious liberty; but, unfortunately, many of the Catholics were disloyal, and they lost no opportunity of showing that disloyalty. They showed disloyal emblems, such as the harp without a crown. They indulged in disloyal music; and those kind of things were calculated to stir up the feelings of Ulstermen. The Protestants were loyal because they were taught to fear God and honour the Queen; they were loyal from a sense of duty, and they were loyal from interest; they saw that where loyalty prevailed there was prosperity and contentment; on the other hand, that where disloyalty prevailed there was discontent and distress; for want of confidence trade languished, and one branch after another—shipbuilding, for instance—disappeared; and they naturally argued that the same result would follow if Home Rule were carried—in fact, that they would lose their occupations, and that in the North of Ireland they would have grass growing on the streets, as it was in the disloyal parts of the country. It had been said in the course of the debate that the Protestants of Ulster were of a persecuting nature; and a similar statement had been attributed also to Earl Spencer. He must say that both charges were entirely against the facts of the case. It was directly the reverse. In a great part of Ireland, unfortunately, religious liberty was only a name. Protestants had to keep quiet, and if they did not they suffered for it. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He (Mr. Ewart) spoke from what he knew, and from what every Member knew who had any information on the subject. He hoped that the Commission would sit and report to the House of Commons, and that they would be able to find out some means by which they could cause the law to be respected in Ireland. For years the law had not been a terror to evil-doers; but the evil-doers had been a terror to the law-abiding, and to those who wished to do well. He hoped that a better state of things might soon arise, and that the Commission about to be appointed to inquire into the industrial condition of Ireland might be able to give some suggestions that would enable the Government to do something for Ireland, and that all Irishmen might unite for the common good.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green), as a Member for one of the divisions of Dublin, said, that if the peace were preserved in Dublin it was because the Catholic majority was not excited by clerical firebrands, as the Protestant majority of Belfast was. Happily they had nobody in Dublin to compare with the Rev. Mr. Hanna or the Rev. Mr. Kane. What was the moral of the speech of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell)? Was it that when the Protestants were in a minority, as in Dublin, they were peaceful and law-abiding; but when they were in a majority, as in Belfast, riot and disturbance, and plunder and murder took place? That was the inference to be drawn from the hon. Member's speech; but he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) refused to accept that view. The disturbances in Belfast were not due to Protestantism; they were inconsistent with its spirit; they were the outcome of a local sore, which, owing to the action of the lay and clerical emissaries of evil and mischief, was not permitted to heal; they were of annual occurrence, and they ought to be looked at in a broader light than that in which they had been considered. They had the key of the whole situation when they looked back and saw that for many a long weary year these unfortunate occurrences were taking place where the Orange organizations prevailed, and nowhere else. In Belfast and Londonderry Orange bands played such tunes as "We'll kick the Pope before us," "Croppies lie down," and "The Protestant Boys," tunes which were specially selected to annoy Catholics. Happily nothing of the kind was done in Dublin by the Catholics. Again, in the North, English loyal tunes were made Party tunes, and were so played as to give offence to Nationalists. It was not to be expected that Nationalists should display the national flags, which were to them the symbols of misrule. They were floated and flaunted by the Ascendancy Party, who had their heels upon the necks of the majority of the Irish people; and these things had inevitably tended to make the emblems of this country very unwelcome and unpleasant to the Irish people. What was wanted was not so much an inquiry into the origin of the recent riots, but that the House of Commons should desire that some steps should be taken that would end these occurrences, and do away with the recurrence of these disgraceful and shameful scenes. To the tune of "God save the Queen," the police were stoned and houses were wrecked, and a man would carry off a bottle of stolen whisky singing "Rule Britannia." The number of killed and injured in the recent riots was probably far greater than was indicated by the newspaper records, because there were sufferers whose cases had not been published. It was possible the "butcher's bill" would amount to 1,000 wounded and killed. The cause of these lamentable occurrences was not the trumpery incidents to which their origin was now attributed. They were due, as he had said, to the incitement of lay and clerical firebrands; and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had incurred a serious responsibility in lighting the fires of race and religious animosity. How would the noble Lord look in the face of those who had been made orphans by his incendiary harangues? Could anything be more barbarous than to keep up by annual celebrations the memory of an internecine war? Was it wise, patriotic, or Christian to re-open these wounds every year? The question now was not who started the last riots, but what was the cause we had them from year to year, and how could we arrange to put an end to them? The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer was no mere idle, thoughtless youth. He had proved himself a man of prevision. When he visited Ireland to stir up the population of the North to resist the legislation of the late Prime Minister he must have known what he was about, and what would probably be the result of his incendiary speeches. From the Leader of a small Party of five men he had become the Leader of the House of Commons. This was the goal which he had so long striven to reach; he had laid his plans to attain this object, and he had at last achieved it. How had he achieved it? By foresight and, if he might use the phrase without offence, by audacity. He had been the means of kicking some men upstairs and others downstairs; but the House could not acquit him of the charge of going over to Ireland to deliver inflammatory speeches for Party ends. It was, in his opinion, the most shameful business that any politician had been engaged in, either connected with Ireland or England. Then, how were the police spoken of? Was it conducive to loyalty and law and order to denounce the police in Belfast as "liveried scoundrels?" This phrase was applied to the police by one of the hon. Members for Belfast. Another hon. Member called them "assassins" and "Morley's murderers;" and the chief organs of the Tory Party in Ireland not only denounced them as assassins, but as cowards, and as men who were capable of shooting from a safe shelter women and children in the streets. The Orange rioters in Belfast had been described as the "residuum" and as "Corner Boys;" but when engaged in work which was considered less objectionable by their sympathizers they were described as everything that was brave and noble. It was the desire of the Catholic and Nationalist people of Ireland that there should be no more of these shameful scenes in the North, or in any other part of Ireland. They were not in favour of arguing political or religious questions with iron rivets. They desired to promote peace and goodwill among the various Parties in the country. He claimed for the Nationalists of Ireland that for many years they had been doing their best to conciliate the small but extreme faction of Orangemen in Ireland, to allay their apprehensions, to remove their prejudices, and to do all they could to live in peace, harmony, and friendship. But this state of things could never be brought about so long as English statesmen and Irish clergymen addressed cruel and shameful incitements to these misguided and unfortunate people, and by such means not only brought disgrace on the name of Protestant, but on the name of Irishmen.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. P. McDonald,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 15.]

(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

SECOND READING. BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) said, that the Home Secretary had intimated his intention, on the part of the Government, to introduce a measure dealing with this question next Session. In these circumstances, he moved that the Order for the second reading of this Bill be discharged.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for Second Reading be discharged."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

MOTION.

SALE UNDER LEGAL PROCESS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Edmund Robertson, Bill to protect (to a limited value) from seizure or sale, under legal process, the necessary furniture, books, tools, wearing apparel, and bedding of a householder and his family, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Handel Cossham, Mr. Howorth, and Mr. William Hunter.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 43.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 2nd September, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Standing Orders Committee, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILL—*Second Reading*—Women's Suffrage (12), *negatived.*

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*Second Reading*—Local Government (Poor Law) (No. 7)* (169); Local Government (County Divisions)* (167); Local Government (Highways)* (168); Local Government (Gas)* (189); Local Government (No. 3)* (170); Local Government (No. 5)* (172); Local Government (No. 6)* (190); Pier and Harbour* (191); Tramways (No. 1)* (192).

NEW PEERS.

The Right Honourable Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., having been created Viscount Cross of Broughton-in-Furness in the county Palatine of Lancaster—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Right Honourable Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., having been created Baron Stanley of Preston in the county Palatine of Lancaster—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Appointed: The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:—

Ld. Privy Seal.
M. Winchester.
M. Bath.
Ld. Chamberlain.
E. Devon.
E. Lindsay.
E. Carnarvon.
E. Milltown.
E. Belmore.
E. Powis.
E. Verulam.
E. Morley.
E. Amherst.
E. Camperdown.
E. Ducie.
E. Sydney.
E. Wharncliffe.
V. Hawarden.
V. Hutchinson.
V. Hardinge.
V. Eversley.
V. Oxenbridge.
L. de Ros.
L. Clinton.
L. Saye and Sele.
L. Balfour of Burley.
L. Boyle.
L. Digby.
L. Thurlow.
L. Hopetoun.
L. Foxford.
L. Colchester.
L. Silchester.
L. Kintore.
L. Sudeley.
L. Belper.
L. Hartismere.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Colville of Culross.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL.—(No. 12.)

(*The Lord Denman.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN: It cannot be said this Session, and in your Lordships'

House, that there is not time to discuss any subject which may be brought before your Lordships. My excuse for troubling you at the present time is this—that when the municipal franchise was extended to women this question came only three days before both Houses of Parliament, and then after both Houses were exhausted by the Irish Church Bill. My Lords, I believe there are those who would wish to see this Bill passed in "another place," and then brought to your Lordships with a sort of threat that your Lordships should follow the behests of those who had passed it. I believe that my motives are pure, and that common sense is on the side of this question being advanced. If it were not my misfortune to be so very old, I should not, perhaps, trespass as much as I do on your notice; but, my Lords, for the last five years I have tried to get this Bill passed, unhappily without success. The measure I now recommend to you is a most moderate one, being confined solely to female householders. I represent a lady who has built four or five cottages and who employs three or four labourers, all, no doubt, very intelligent people. She can only talk to these people and to her tenantry about their prospects, and can only tell them that she looks to them to exercise their privilege as voters—according to their consciences of course—for she can set them no example, and can give them no information that they may deem worthy of their consideration, because, from a political point of view, they look down upon a person who has no right to the franchise. At the time all the municipal officers of the country met together at the Mansion House, it was my duty to inquire, as I did of the Mayor of Sheffield, as to the working of the female franchise in connection with Municipal Corporation elections. He held that it was a very unjust thing that women were not admitted before, because if they were outside the municipality they were permitted to vote in relation to such matters as watching, and paving, and lighting; but if they happened to belong to a corporate town they were deprived of these votes. My Lords, two years ago I brought forward this question, and the late Earl Cairns wrote to me with regard to it on the 9th of July—a very eventful and trying period, for it preceded the time which put an end to all Business, because of the pressure put on Parliament in regard to the Representation of the People Bill. His Lordship wrote to me and said—

> "I hear that your Women's Suffrage Bill stands for to-morrow. I take an interest in the question, and should be sorry if anything were to lead to its having an unfavourable reception in the House, but it stands before Lord Houghton's Marriage Bill, and the House will be impatient to come to a division on that Bill before dinner. Might I suggest for your consideration the desirability of postponing the Bill to the next open evening?"

My Lords, nothing there was said about the propriety of bringing the Bill before the House. The difficulty was only the amount of Business standing on the Paper which had to be disposed of before my Bill could be reached, which induced the noble Earl to suggest that I should wait for an open evening. Your Lordships well know that there was no open evening at that time, and I will only say on this point that I have waited for an open evening. I have succeeded in finding opportunities before, and I now avail myself of the present opportunity, for it cannot be contended that this is not an open evening. This is so completely a women's question that I cannot help thinking it ought to precede the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. *Apropos* of that, there was a long argument by Lord Bramwell in *The Nineteenth Century* on the subject not long ago, and it certainly seems to me that his Lordship's law is not very sound, because he says that if, before the passing of Lord Lyndhurst's Act, a man married again after going through the ceremony of marriage with his deceased wife's sister he ought to have been prosecuted for bigamy. If a man marries a deceased wife's sister and then deserts her he is one of the basest of mankind. The Bill I now propose I would recommend to your Lordships on religious grounds. I maintain that women are to be trusted with the franchise, because they are better than men. They read their Bible more assiduously, and are altogether better living persons. I have three widows, tenants, who hold houses and some little land, and I certainly think they ought not only to have the privilege of voting at municipal elections, but also of voting for our local Members of Parliament according to their appreciation of the characters of those Gentlemen. We have many examples in the East as well as at home of the virtues and mental capacities of the other sex; and history affords us many instances of gifted and illustrious women. Why should they not be permitted to vote? It is a great privilege to be able to vote; but I believe that if it were conferred upon women a chastening influence would be exerted upon those institutions which are the outcome of strong partizanship—the National League for instance—whilst the Women's Suffrage Association would be gradually superseded and dissolved. The women would join other Associations, where their influence for good would be greatly felt, especially in relation to those questions which more intimately concern their sex. Questions that they are specially interested in would receive greater attention, and would be more frequently brought before the constituencies by candidates, and more often brought before Parliament by Members. I am sure it is better that I should trouble your Lordships with this Bill than that you should sit here always doing nothing. I should be sorry to speculate too much on the matter; but I have no doubt, looking at the pledges which were given at the hustings during the General Election, that if this measure came before the other House it would be carried by a large majority, and surely it would be a gracious thing of your Lordships to disarm opposition, and to give the Bill at once a second reading. I have endeavoured to state my reasons for bringing forward the measure, and all I have to say is that if you pass the Bill now it may save your Lordships from having to listen to me again on the subject. I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY): The Question that I shall have to put to your Lordships is—"That this Bill be now read a second time;" and as I have, unfortunately, to vote against that Question, I wish to say that the emphatic word is the word "now," because it would be impossible to say that it is desirable that the Bill should be introduced for discussion on the 2nd of September. At the same time, I cannot but sympathize very much with what the noble Lord has said, and I believe the proposal is one upon which your Lordships entertain different opinions. The only reason I address your Lordships at all is that I do not wish to be understood as being against the principle the noble Lord (Lord Denman) advocates. On the contrary, I think it extremely inconvenient that the Bill should be "now" read a second time.

On Question, *resolved* in the *negative.*

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—RETURN OF CASUALTIES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

EARL DE LA WARR said, that, in the absence of any official information relative to the recent riots in Belfast, he wished to ask the Government whether they would give a Return of the number of persons killed and wounded in the serious collisions which had taken place between the people and the police in the streets of that city? A Commission had been appointed to inquire into the subject of these riots; but they knew the time that usually elapsed before any Report of a Commission was placed before Parliament; and he hoped, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government would not find it inconvenient to lay the Return which he asked for upon the Table of the House at an early day. There was naturally a feeling that the use of firearms by the police in the streets of a town was somewhat questionable, and especially when the military were at hand, whose training and discipline rendered them more cool and less liable to momentary irritation. Though he should be most unwilling to make any remark which could be interpreted as casting the slightest censure upon such a body of men as the Irish Constabulary, yet he must add that if the accounts which had appeared in the public Press relative to the collisions which had unhappily occurred between the people and the police in the streets of Belfast were correct, the number of persons who had been killed and wounded was very considerable, and possibly larger than circumstances would seem to justify. Among the statements to which he referred there was one which seemed especially to require notice. It was to the effect that on one occasion during the riots the Constabulary fired from their barracks in the town indiscriminately upon a crowd in the street, the consequence being that many innocent persons, including women and children, were killed or wounded. There was another statement to which he desired briefly to call attention. It was the Report of Dr. Foy, surgeon of the Whitworth Hospital, Dublin, prepared, as it seemed, for *The Medical Press.* In this Report it was stated—

> "The gunshot injuries were of two kinds, those produced by bullets, either from rifles or revolvers, and by buckshot. The bullet wounds were of the usual kind, and, in the majority of cases, terminated fatally. There is abundant evidence in the missiles found in the bodies of the unhappy victims to prove that the bullets used were what is known as 'regulation' size. The revolver wounds were, comparatively speaking, few in number, and, as a rule, did not prove fatal. Buckshot was very largely used; and perhaps I can best explain here that, as a missile, it has very little force. . . . The greater number of the fatal injuries were inflicted on the head and chest. These injuries, in many instances, resulted from buckshot wounds, the pellets finding an entrance into the brain by the eye, or when fired at very close distances possessing sufficient momentum to penetrate the bony wall. . . . . In some cases the shot was fired so close to the person as to penetrate through several folds of clothing."

He would not go further into the painful details in this Report, including the deaths of women and children. Among them was one of the mother of several little children standing at the door and lifting a child into the house. The mother was shot dead by a bullet fired from a height. Dr. Foy goes on to say—

> "It is a task of considerable difficulty to form a correct estimate of the number of injuries, as many of the cases went from one practitioner to another. . . . I have, however, taken pains to analyze all the details supplied to me, and I consider I speak with some accuracy when I give the total number treated as 582, while the number of deaths, as reported by the various gentlemen, may be taken as 34."

He felt bound to say that this Report bore upon the face of it the desire to state the truth without bias or prejudice. He had only now to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether the police in Ireland had a discretionary power of charging their carbines with buckshot instead of ball, and of using their firearms without the previous reading of the Riot Act by a civil magistrate; and, also, whether any officers in command of troops had lately been invested with the authority of a civil magistrate?

Moved, "That there be laid before this House Return of persons killed and wounded in the recent riots at Belfast."—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

EARL CADOGAN (LORD PRIVY SEAL) said, that, with reference to the first part of the Notice of his noble Friend, he was sorry to say that at present the Government had a Return of 28 deaths as having occurred during the lamentable disturbances at Belfast; but with regard to the list of wounded for which his noble Friend asked, it would be impossible for the Government to provide such a Return. They had at present no means of ascertaining the exact number of wounded who had been admitted to the hospitals at Belfast, or of those who had been treated at their own homes. Under these circumstances, it was impossible that any Return which could be furnished by the Government at present would be in any way reliable. He might, however, remind his noble Friend that a Commission had been issued to inquire into the whole of the circumstances connected with these riots. That Commission suspended its sittings a short time ago; but it had now been strengthened by the addition of a fourth Member, and it was hoped that it would resume its labours before long. When the Commission had reported the Government would be in a better position to ascertain the whole of the facts respecting which his noble Friend asked for information. On the subject of firing upon the people by the police during these riots, he also must plead for some delay before information could be given by the Government. His noble Friend alluded to a Report which he had himself seen, and which had been published in the newspapers, by a private Commission which he understood was sent by the Loyal and Patriotic Union to report on the state of matters in Belfast. Without wishing in any way to impugn the veracity, the *bona fides,* or the accuracy of the statements contained in that Report, it would, he thought, be understood that it was impossible for the Government to accept statements made by a private Commission of that character in the same unreserved manner in which they would accept those made by the Commission, which, it was hoped, would report before long. The noble Earl must, therefore, excuse him if he declined to enter into the discussion which he had raised on the question of the firing on the people by the police. One question which the noble Earl had asked he thought he could answer—namely, whether the use of buckshot or bullets was discretionary on the part of the police? The discretion in the matter lay not with the police themselves, but with the officers in command of the police, to whom was intrusted the duty of ordering with what charge the rifles should be fired.

EARL DE LA WARR explained that the Report referred to was made to *The Medical Press*, and did not come from the Loyal and Patriotic Union.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 2nd September, 1886.

MINUTES.] — PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*) — *Considered as amended* — Portsmouth and Hayling Railway, *debate adjourned.*
PUBLIC BILL—*Second Reading*—Secret Service (Repeal) * [41].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PORTSMOUTH AND HAYLING RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Amendments made.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended (Queen's *Consent* signified).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): Before this Bill passes beyond the control of the House, the House will do well to receive some assurance from the promoters that it does not in any way touch common lands. I should be the last to impose any obstacle in the way of the Bill passing; but considering what took place on the 11th of May last with respect to the Hayling Common, and that the House took the very strong step of refusing to confirm a Provisional Order, I think it is desirable we should know whether this Bill in any way touches, not only Hayling Common, but any other Common in the neighbourhood.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I have not received any instructions upon the point. Perhaps it would be well to put the Bill down for to-morrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member oppose the third reading of the Bill?

MR. J. E. ELLIS: I do until that assurance is given.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BANTRY BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that the Chairman of the Bantry Board of Guardians, at the recent meetings of the Board, refused to receive notices of motion relating to eviction notices which may be served on the relieving officer of the Bantry Union; whether, according to Article twelve of the General Regulations for the Governing of Poor Law Boards, it is the duty of the Chairman to receive such notices; if the Local Government Board for Ireland are aware of his refusal to do so; and, whether they will issue a sealed order to compel him to act in future in accordance with the General Regulations referred to?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It is a fact that the Chairman of the Bantry Board of Guardians refused to receive the notice mentioned. The Local Government Board think that it should properly have been received under Article 13 of the General Regulations, and they have intimated this opinion to the Guardians. At the same time, they do not think the circumstances would warrant them in issuing a sealed Order as suggested, and I believe there is a legal remedy open to any person aggrieved.

Mr. GILHOOLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that about three weeks since the Local Government Board intimated their opinion to the Guardians, and that the Chairman refused to receive notices?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: It may be so.

Mr. M. HEALY (Cork) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would say what the legal remedy was?

[No reply.]

ARMY (CLOTHING DEPARTMENT)—CLOTH FOR ARMY UNIFORMS.

Mr. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, What are the steps that will in future be taken to inform manufacturers in Ireland periodically of the desire of the Government to receive tenders for the supply of cloth for Army uniforms?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): The exigencies of the Service necessitate the adoption of patterns of cloth which are not made by the trade generally, and hitherto have been supplied by Yorkshire and West of England firms, who have facilities for the production of these special cloths. If any Irish firm desires to take up this special manufacture, I have to say that I have given directions that patterns of the cloths shall be at once forwarded to Dublin, where they can be inspected. Advertisements of the War Office requirements will also be inserted in some of the principal Irish newspapers; and if an apparently satisfactory tender is received a trial order will probably be given.

Mr. HOOPER asked whether, in the distribution of the advertisements amongst the Irish newspapers, the claims of those newspapers representing popular opinion would be considered?

[No reply.]

SUGAR BOUNTIES (ABOLITION)—AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. TOMLINSON (Preston) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether Her Majesty's Government would be favourable to the early assembling of an International Conference, with a view to the total abolition, by Treaty, of all bounties on the export of sugar?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I can only reply to my hon. Friend in the same sense in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied to a similar Question which was asked on Monday last.

THE PATENT OFFICE—THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

Mr. TOMLINSON (Preston) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is intended to take up the inquiry set on foot by the late Government into the working of the Patent Office; and, whether the inquiry will deal with the administration of the Acts relating to Trade Marks and Copyright of Design?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Committee appointed to inquire into the duties, organization, and arrangements of the Patent Office have concluded their investigations, and the Board of Trade are awaiting their Report, which has been delayed owing to the Dissolution. The Board of Trade trust that the Committee may be induced to extend their investigation into the Trade Marks and Designs Department of the Patent Office.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPH CLERKS—SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES.

Mr. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) (for Mr. P. J. Power) asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is a fact that telegraph clerks withdrawn from the Belfast Post Office for relief duty at other offices in the Northern District, are only granted a subsistence allowance of 3*s.* per day; and, whether clerks withdrawn from the other offices in the same District, for the same purpose, are granted 2*s.* per day; and, if so, under what authority is the surveyor, Mr. Walter Ahearn, authorised to make the distinction, and to over-ride the specific instructions of the Postmaster General, issued in the official circular of the 19th June, 1883, which regulates the rate of allowance to clerks employed on relief duty, and states that when so employed they are to receive at the rate of 5*s.* per day?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): I have to inform the hon. Member, in reply to his Question, that the Circular of the 19th of June, 1883, to which he refers, prescribes that an extra allowance, not exceeding *5s.* a day for subsistence, may be granted to sorting clerks and telegraphists in the United Kingdom when detached from one office to another for the purpose of giving assistance in times of pressure. It is found that the cost of living at some places is greater than in others, and it is desirable to give a certain latitude to the head of a district to fix the allowance within a maximum according to the circumstances of the case. The duty is voluntary, and there are plenty of applicants.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT — THE ANNUAL REPORTS.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists in the Army Medical Department by recent changes in the publication of the annual value of Statistical, Sanitary, and Medical Reports; whether it is the case that, for several years past, instead of a single copy of each Annual Report, two copies of each have been printed, one in a blue paper cover with, and one in a yellow paper cover without, the Special Reports by Army Medical Officers; the copy without the Appendix of Special Reports has been presented to Parliament and has been purchasable, the price being marked upon it; the copy with the Special Reports has not had a price marked on it, and has not been obtainable by purchase; and, whether he will consider the advisability of returning to the original form of publication, which was suggested by the Royal Sanitary Commissioners as stimulating professional zeal by inducing medical officers to make observations of a record in the departmental volume?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, the present form of publication of the Army Medical Reports was approved on the recommendation of a Committee on Official Statistics. No expressions of dissatisfaction in regard to it have reached the War Office. It was held to be sufficient to include the Report by Departmental officers in the Departmental volume which is supplied to station hospitals for the use of medical officers doing duty in those hospitals. He would consider whether there would be any objection to placing the Departmental volume on sale.

PORT OF DUBLIN — THE GREAT EASTERN STEAMSHIP.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is true that objections have been raised by the Port and Harbour Commissioners of Dublin to a proposal for sending the Great Eastern Steamship to that city; whether he is aware that there is a sufficient depth of water for the vessel, and that inquiries made on the spot show that she can be berthed in the port with safety, and without interference with the ordinary traffic; and, whether he is aware that the municipal and port authorities of harbours on the French coast have not only expressed their gratification at the proposal for sending the ship to those places, but have also offered, at their own charge, to provide all proper facilities for her reception?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I have no knowledge of the circumstances referred to, nor have the Board of Trade any control over Harbour Authorities in such a matter.

CRIMINAL LAW — EXCESSIVE SENTENCE—CASE OF GEORGE PARISH.

MR. ISAACS (Newington, Walworth) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the sentence passed at the Dartford Petty Sessions on Saturday last on George Parish of six weeks' hard labour for taking five pieces of wood from a field belonging to William Moore for the purpose of lighting a fire to cook some food; and, whether, having regard to the fact that the police knew nothing against his character previously, he will be prepared to advise a remission of the sentence?

MR. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the sentence of six weeks' hard labour, passed by the Dartford petty sessional bench, on a man named George Parish, on Saturday August 28, for taking a few sticks from a field to light a fire with in order to cook some food; and, whether he will consider this case in connection with the case of Abigail Bird, who was sentenced to a month's hard labour by the same bench for a similar offence on Saturday April 10th of the present year, and which case was brought under the notice of the Home Secretary in the House of Commons on April 15th?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): It is not quite correct to say, as stated in the Question of the hon. Member for Doncaster, that the prisoner was convicted "of taking a few sticks from a field." The stolen wood consisted of five new pieces, of 5 feet each in length, which had been specially prepared and taken to the spot for the purpose of erecting a fence. The prisoner was one of a company of hop-pickers employed in the district. A strong Bench of Magistrates, including a Queen's Counsel, were of opinion that an adequate punishment was necessary in order to protect the neighbourhood from continual depredations of this nature. But this morning I have received a letter from Mr. Moore, the owner of the wood, stating that he considers the offence a trivial one, and that he is anxious for the immediate release of the man. Under these circumstances, I think that a week's imprisonment, of which several days have already elapsed, would have been considered by the magistrates themselves sufficient punishment, and I have given directions for the prisoner's release at the end of the week.

CUSTOMS SERVICE—PORT OF BELFAST.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that officers in the Customs Service, known as boatmen, stationed at the Port of Belfast, are called upon to be on duty from sixteen to twenty hours at a time; whether complaints regarding the excessive length of these hours have been frequently made, and if resignations have been sent in solely in consequence thereof; and, if it would be possible to alter the rules and regulations of the service with regard to the hours of labour?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.), in reply, said, the rule with regard to Customs service with regard to boatmen was that they were liable to duty for the whole of each alternate day; but they were only employed when actually required. Ample opportunities for meals and rest were given, and there had been no complaints in Belfast, except in the case of one man who was appointed in February this year, and who left in July. There was no difficulty in getting any number of qualified men on the present conditions, and he saw no reason for making any change.

ADMIRALTY—CONTRACTS FOR PORK AND BUTTER.

MR. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If his attention has been drawn to the Return, No. 228, dated 24th June 1885, by which it appears that large contracts for salt pork and preserved butter, both staple articles of Irish production, have been entered into with foreigners during the past seven years; and, if the Lords of the Admiralty will in future invite tenders from Irish merchants for these supplies to the Navy, and, quality and price considered, will give a preference to the home producers?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. FORWOOD) (Lancashire, Ormskirk): In reply to the first portion of the Question of the hon. Member for Sligo, contracts for salt pork have only been entered into with foreigners in cases where, after advertisement, the tenders received from foreign firms have shown a material advantage to the Public Service when compared with those sent in by houses established in the United Kingdom. As regards the second part of the Question, the Admiralty intend to continue, when requiring supplies of pork, their system of advertising in Irish papers; and, as promised by the First Lord of the Admiralty, in reply to a Question put to him on Tuesday, will give to tenders that are at all equal a preference to the home producer. Butter is only purchased for use on board the troopships, and then only after a careful examination of the samples and prices, which are obtained from firms in Ireland as well as elsewhere.

IRISH CHURCH ACT—RELIEF OF GLEBE PURCHASERS.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Government contemplate introducing during the present Session a Bill for the relief of glebe purchasers under the Irish Church Act, whose position was described by his predecessor as "a particularly sad one;" and, if so, how soon will the Bill be introduced?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, there was an express provision for the relief of glebe purchasers introduced into the Land Purchase Act of last year. He understood, from the Question of the hon. Member, that some further relief was required. He was not able to give any assurance on the subject, and could not undertake any legislation on it now.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the propriety of extending the time of payment?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he believed that that was precisely what was contemplated by the Bill of last Session.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS AT GARRISON, CO. FERMANAGH.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true, as stated by "One of the Doomed," in *The Fermanagh Reporter* of 26th August, that—

> "Half a score of evictions were carried out, ten or twelve days ago, on the property of the Marquis of Ely, at Garrison, county Fermanagh;"

and, whether, in view of the fact that a large number of the tenants of the Marquis of Ely were evicted in the county of Wexford also, the Government will exercise some influence to prevent this nobleman's agent from carrying out these evictions?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It is reported in *The Fermanagh Reporter* that evictions took place on Lord Ely's estate, in the county Fermanagh, on the 14th of last month. All the persons evicted were re-admitted as caretakers, pending redemption. I suppose the other evictions referred to by the hon. Member were those about which he asked me a Question the other day. I have nothing to add to the answer I then gave. There appears to me to be no room for any action of the Government in the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But the right hon. Gentleman then stated that the evicted people were forced by the local branch of the National League to go into the poorhouse. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is no local branch of the National League, and that his statement has caused considerable indignation in the district?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: When I saw the Question on the Paper I directed further inquiries to be made, the result of which I shall know in a day, and, of course, if I was wrong I shall say so.

INDIA (MADRAS)—OFFICIAL SCANDALS.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the repeated occurrence of official scandals in Madras during the last five years; and, whether an independent inquiry will be made into the now current Crole-Sullivan scandal, which, during the past six months, has been commented on by the whole Indian press, Native and European?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The careful attention of the Secretary of State is always given to every occurrence of an official character which takes place at Madras, or any other place in British India. The case of Mr. Crole has been fully inquired into by the late Secretary of State in Council, and that of Mr. Sullivan is now under consideration.

INDIA (MADRAS)—THE LATE PRINCESS OF TANJORE.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is a fact that the late Princess of Tanjore adopted a son, with the consent of the Government of India; whether it is a fact that the rule laid down by the Indian Government regarding stipends to the Tanjore family, is that, upon the death of any stipendiary, the descendant or relation should receive a moiety of the stipend; whether it is a fact that the late Princess of Tanjore had a stipend of 3,000 rupees per month, and to state upon what ground the adopted son should not be allowed a moiety of the stipend; whether it is a fact that Mr. Kavanagh memorialised the Indian Government for an allowance adequate to maintain and educate the adopted son of the late Princess of Tanjore; and, whether, at the present time, the adopted son is in an abject state of poverty?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The Government of India did not consent to the adoption of a son by the late Princess of Tanjore. There is no such rule applicable to female members of the Tanjore family as that stated in the Question. The late Princess of Tanjore had a stipend for life of 3,000 rupees a month. There was no ground for continuing any part of it to the adopted son. Mr. Kavanagh did memorialize the Indian Government for an allowance for the adopted son. The Secretary of State has no information as to the present circumstances of the adopted son.

POST OFFICE—MAILS IN SUTHERLAND.

MR. MACDONALD CAMERON (Wick, &c.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether a Petition has recently been received by the Postmaster General from the inhabitants of the parishes of Dornoch and Creich, in the county of Sutherland, praying that a mail gig be run between Dornoch and Bonar Bridge, as being more expeditious and convenient than the two rural postmen now employed in carrying letters; and, whether it is the intention of the postal authorities to acquiesce in the petitioners' prayer?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): A Petition was received several months ago, and was answered to the effect that the establishment of a mail car service between Dornoch and Bonar Bridge would involve greater expense than the circumstances of the case justified, and that unless the Memorialists were prepared to enter into a guarantee for the increased expenditure their wishes could not be acceded to. No more recent Memorial had been received.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—MEMORIAL OF FISHERY OFFICERS.

MR. MACDONALD CAMERON (Wick, &c.) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is true that the Scotch fishery officers memorialized the Fishery Board for an increase of pay and travelling allowances, in consequence of greatly increased duties; and, if so, whether the Board refused to entertain the said Memorial; whether, in addition, a deputation of fishery officers was received by the Board, and a promise given them that their grievances would receive early attention; and, whether the Fishery Board have taken any steps for the amelioration of the condition of the officers?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.), in reply, said, he had inquired into this matter, but had not yet received an answer. If the hon. Gentleman would put down the Question for a subsequent day he should be glad to answer it.

ARMY CANTEENS (IRELAND).

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can inform the House of the number of Army canteens in Ireland for the supplying of which the Junior Army and Navy Stores still hold contracts; and, of the total number of Army canteens in that Country?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): There are no Returns at the War Office which gives the information asked in the first part of the Question. The number of canteens in Ireland is 46.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—CAVALRY SWORDS, PATTERN 1884.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, If he would explain why all the cavalry saddles, pattern 1884, have been recalled; have any reports upon them been received by commanding officers; what is the name of the inspector who passed the saddles; where are the saddles now, and can an order be obtained to inspect them; and, in the case of an experimental issue, is it the custom of the Department to pay the contractors before the result of the experiment is known?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): These saddles have been recalled, not on account of bad manufacture, but of faulty pattern. The pattern was approved upon the

Report of a Committee of Cavalry officers, to whom the matter was referred. Reports have been received from Commanding Officers to whom the saddles were issued. These Reports were carefully considered, and it was decided that the design was not satisfactory. As the fault of the saddle is in the design rather than the manufacture, the Inspector is not to blame. The greater part of the saddles are now at Woolwich for alteration, and the hon. and gallant Member shall have all facilities if he wishes to inspect them. The contract having been made in the usual way, on a provisionally approved pattern, the contractor was entitled to his money when he had passed the supplies.

POST OFFICE—TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

MR. DWYER GRAY (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has refused to several Telephone Companies permission to open public call offices at Railway stations; whether his attention has been drawn to the declarations made in the House by his predecessor, the late Mr. Fawcett, on the 22nd May 1884, that—

> "Nothing was further from his desire than to do anything that was unfair to, or severe upon, the Telephone Companies, or anything that was likely to strangle them. He was anxious that the public should obtain a supply of telephone communication, either through private enterprise or through the Post Office, according to which could supply it to the public most efficiently and on the most reasonable terms,"

and that—

> "in safeguarding the public revenue he had been, and should continue to be, most scrupulously careful not to throw any unnecessary impediment in the way of the development of private enterprise;"

and, whether it is the fact that the Post Office Department neither open telephone call offices themselves at Railway stations, over the lines of which they possess exclusive wayleaves, nor will permit the Companies to do so, although the latter are willing to pay for the privilege?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): I have to state that I find the attention of the Department was called, in April last, to a statement of the Managing Director of the United Telephone Company, that the Company had made arrangements with certain Railway Companies to open telephone exchanges at all their stations. Thereupon, a letter was addressed to the United Telephone Company, pointing out that such arrangements could not be carried out without the special consent of the Postmaster General, the right of transacting telegraph business at the stations in question having been purchased by the State. The Company replied that their Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Managing Director, would come to the Post Office on an early date to discuss the matter. They have not yet done so; and, meanwhile, the Department has not allowed any call office to be established at railway stations. I have to add that if these gentlemen lay their views before the Post Office they will be carefully considered.

MR. DWYER GRAY asked, if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that application had been made for permission to open a call office at Bray, near Dublin, and that it was peremptorily refused?

MR. RAIKES said, that matter had been brought under his notice, and he could only say that the application was made by a Company subsidiary to this United Telephone Company, and therefore it could not be entertained, at all events in the absence of any movement of the United Telephone Company in the matter.

MR. DWYER GRAY asked, if he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that if the views of the United Telephone Company were brought before him in the way suggested they would be considered?

MR. RAIKES: Certainly.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE BANTRY BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If evictions have been recently carried out on the property of the Earl of Bantry and of Mr. W. S. Bird; if the relieving officer of the Bantry Union was present at these evictions; if Mr. F. W. Payne, Chairman of the Bantry Board of Guardians, is agent to the Earl of Bantry; if Mr. W. S. Bird is Deputy Vice Chairman of the Bantry Board of Guardians; whether both those gentlemen voted with the majority against a motion requesting the relieving officer of the Bantry Union to place all notices of evictions served on him in his official capacity before the Bantry Board of Guardians; and, whether the Local Government Board for Ireland will compel the Guardians of the Bantry Union to require the relieving officer to place all notices of eviction served on him before the Bantry Board of Guardians?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol W.), in reply, said, two evictions had taken place, as stated in the Question, on the properties mentioned. The relieving officer of the Bantry Union was not present at the evictions, nor was he under any obligation to be so. Mr. Payne, Chairman of the Bantry Board of Guardians, was not now agent for the Earl of Bantry; but Mr. Bird occupied the position mentioned in the Question. Both gentlemen voted with the majority against a motion requesting the relieving officer to place all notices of eviction served on him before the Board of Guardians. There did not appear to be any legal obligation on the Guardians to require the relieving officer to do so. At the same time, the Local Government Board thought it would be right to do so, and they had so informed the Guardians.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) ACT, 1885—SITE OF COLDBATH FIELDS PRISON.

MR. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What steps are being taken to carry out the provisions of the Housing of the Working Classes (England) Act, by erecting dwellings on the site of the House of Correction, Coldbath Fields?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): The Housing of the Working Classes (England) Act, 1885, as amended in Committee of this House, contains no provisions (such as was contained in the original Bill) for the erection of dwellings on the site of Coldbath Fields Prison. The Home Department have taken the only steps in their power. They have offered the site (as they were bound to do under the Prisons Act, 1877) to the County Justices, who have declined to purchase it. They have since offered to sell the site to the Metropolitan Board of Works, who have also refused to purchase. It now rests with the Home Secretary to sell this site as best he can; and in so doing I shall endeavour, if possible, to make arrangements under which the land may be utilized for the benefit of the labouring classes, either by the erection of dwellings or the creation of open spaces.

IRELAND (SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICT)—CLARE (SIR REDVERS BULLER).

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can state the reasons for including the county of Clare in the district placed under the civil authority of General Sir Redvers Buller?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The record of outrages in county Clare is not so bad as in county Kerry; but the condition of the county is very far from satisfactory, owing to the existence of much intimidation and of secret societies, and in forming this new district it was thought advisable to include Clare within it.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION IN THE HOUSE.

CAPTAIN COTTON (Cheshire, Wirral) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether anything has been considered with regard to electrical communication to different parts of the House, as promised on the 11th March last; and, if nothing has been yet considered, whether he can undertake to provide some such system of communication during the forthcoming Recess?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said: In the unavoidable absence of my right hon. and learned Friend, I beg to say that this matter has been under the consideration of the Office of Works since March last, and that some difficulties which arose had not yet been overcome when the recent change of Government took place. The present First Commissioner will carefully consider the matter, and will endeavour, during the Recess, to provide hon. Members with the facilities which they desire.

ARMY—SMALL ARMS—THE SWORDS OF THE 2ND DRAGOON GUARDS.

CAPTAIN COTTON (Cheshire, Wirral) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether his attention has been drawn to a paragraph in *The St. James's Gazette* of Saturday last, relative to the issue of new swords to the 2nd Dragoon Guards preparatory to their departure for India, and stating in effect that the sword seemed to be made of "tin," and that the commanding officer himself tested them in the riding school by "cutting at the Turk's head," and that as a result sword after sword flew to pieces; and further, if the above be true, from what manufactory the swords in question were procured, and what steps are being taken to provide the regiment with an efficient weapon?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): As far as I know there is no foundation for the statement referred to. Prior to its embarkation the regiment received a complete equipment of new swords made in the Government factory at Enfield, as to which no complaint of any kind has reached the War Office. If anything of the nature of the occurrence mentioned in the hon. Member's Question had taken place it would have been the duty of the Commanding Officer to report it.

WAR DEPARTMENT — NAVAL ORDNANCE — THE "COLLINGWOOD" GUN.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to chase-hoop the guns of the *Collingwood* pattern, which, according to the statement of the late Secretary of State for War, were fourteen in number; whether it is intended to chase-hoop all other guns in the Service of a similar pattern from six inches diameter of bore upwards; whether the chase-hooping is to be performed by means of several isolated hoops shrunk on or by means of one continuous hoop or jacket; whether the cost of the chase-hooping will not be about £25,000, if it does not exceed that sum; and, whether this expense would not have been saved the Country if the Ordnance Committee had acted on the letter addressed to that Committee by Mr. William Anderson in 1884?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes, Sir; it is intended to chase-hoop the guns of the *Collingwood* pattern, as was stated by my Predecessor in this House on the 31st of May last. A detail of the guns proposed to be chase-hooped is given in the Report of the special Committee, which was laid on the Table on Tuesday. The chase-hooping is to be performed by means of a series of hoops in close contact being shrunk on. £25,000 is the sum estimated. There is no reason for the presumption in the last paragraph of the hon. and gallant Member's Question.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—UNPAID EXTRA REMUNERATION.

MR. B. KELLY (Donegal, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that, under the Representation of the People Act, a considerable sum was allocated for the remuneration of the various persons to whom additional work was given, with a view to having the registers properly made out, and various such persons, notably the rate collectors in several unions, discharged such extra work without having received any remuneration whatever for their additional and efficiently rendered services?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, there was no reason to suppose that the money which was voted by Parliament last year for this purpose was not equitably distributed, or that any persons having proper claims on it were overlooked; but if the hon. Member knew of any case, or would give him any information on the subject, he would have it inquired into.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—COMPOUNDING DEBTORS.

MR. M. HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the complaints of Irish traders generally as to the great inconvenience arising from the practice common in the case of compounding debtors of making their composition notes payable at their own residence; and, whether there is anything to prevent a Rule of Court being made compelling debtors carrying compositions under the protection of the Court or after bankruptcy, to domicile their composition notes at a bank or other convenient place?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I have not heard of the complaints referred to; and as arrangements under the protection of the Court on compositions after bankruptcy can only be carried with the consent of the majority of creditors, the latter have it in their power to insist on composition notes being drawn in the form that is most convenient in the particular case. Under such circumstances, a Rule of Court on the subject would be inconvenient and out of place.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—MUNSTER WINTER ASSIZES.

MR. M. HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it is the fact that the Winter Assizes for the Munster Assize County have been held in the City of Cork every year except one since the Winter Assizes Act was passed in 1877; whether, in the other provinces, a similar practice of confining the Winter Assizes to one city prevails; whether it is the fact that an additional county (Tipperary) has now been added to the four already included in the Cork Winter Assize County; whether his attention has been called to the repeated complaints of the jurors of the City of Cork as to their being summoned year after year to try prisoners from nearly the whole of Munster, and to the recent resolution of the Cork Chamber of Commerce and Shipping on the subject; and, whether it is proposed to hold the Munster Winter Assizes in Cork this year?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): In consequence of the city of Cork being so much the most convenient place for holding the Southern Winter Assizes, which, on the last occasion, included county Tipperary, they have been uniformly held there. Neither the same reason nor the same practice exists in any other Province. I have read the Resolution of the Cork Chamber of Commerce and Shipping on the subject, and I have no doubt that the jurors feel the work irksome. I am sure, however, that they will be still as willing as they have been hitherto to perform the duties imposed on them by the State for the public interest.

MR. M. HEALY: The right hon. and learned Gentleman has not answered the last portion of the Question.

MR. HOLMES: I have more than once said that at the present time it would be impossible to make arrangements for the Winter Assizes, because they cannot be well made until the month of November. It is right to say that it seems to me that the same considerations of convenience which existed with regard to Cork last time will probably apply on this occasion also.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) asked, whether it was not the invariable practice at the Winter Assizes to try all the cases from county Kerry at Cork?

MR. HOLMES: The same rules applied with regard to Kerry cases as with regard to other cases.

MR. E. HARRINGTON inquired if the right hon. and learned Gentleman was aware that there were four times as many Kerry cases tried at the Cork Winter Assizes as there were at the two Assizes held in the county of Kerry?

[No reply.]

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — MR. MOLONY, R.M., CO. MAYO.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, on Monday, 26th July, at Ballaghaderin, county Mayo, Mr. Molony, Resident Magistrate, in refusing to commit a child to an industrial school, used the following language:—

> "People have no right to be stocking the Country with children unless they are able to support them. If they are not able to rear them they must give up the trade;"

and, if so, whether he will direct the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the conduct of Mr. Molony?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Resident Magistrate in question informed me that the words which were used had not been accurately reported. He pointed out that the Industrial Schools Act was not intended to relieve parents of the cost of the maintenance of their families on the sole ground of poverty; and he deprecated improvident marriages which led to efforts on the part of parents to get their children maintained at the public cost.

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—LOAN FOR A NATIONAL SCHOOL, MILTOWN MALBAY.

MR. DWYER GRAY (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Board of Works have refused to grant a loan to the Rev. Mr. White, parish priest of Miltown Malbay, for the erection of a national school, although the proposed school was approved by the Board of National Education; whether, for many years, the Rev. Mr. White was unable to procure a site for the school owing to the refusal of Lord Leconfield, who owns all the land in the neighbourhood, to give land for the purpose; whether the Rev. Mr. White at last purchased the interest in an agricultural holding, subject to the Land Act, and thus acquired a site; and, on what grounds the refusal was based?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said, he had no information as to Mr. White's difficulty in getting a site for a school. The reason why a loan could not be made was that a "present tenant" under the Land Act was not an owner within the meaning of the Act under which loans to schools were made. This had been explained to Mr. White. There were several communications.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DEDUCTIONS FROM PENSIONS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, To what purpose the money deducted for past misconduct from the retiring pensions of members of the Royal Irish Constabulary is applied?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Question of the hon. Member appears to be based upon a misapprehension. Men guilty of past misconduct are recommended to the Treasury for lesser rates of pension than the maximum allowable by law. No money becomes thereby available for other uses, as only the required amount is included in the preparation of the Estimates. No deduction is ever made from any authorized pension.

DUBLIN PORT AND DOCK DUES.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the President of the Board of Trade, If the "Port dues" imposed by the Dublin Port and Docks Board on fishing boats from Arklow, Howth, Dungarvan, and other places on the coast of Ireland, can be diminished, so as to allow the fishermen to dispose of their fish at a profit in Dublin?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: From a communication which I have now received from the Dublin Port and Docks Board, it appears that the harbour dues payable at Dublin are fixed by Act of Parliament, which gives them no power to vary or reduce them. The fishing boats referred to by the hon. Member are subject to these dues, which average only 4*s.* each vessel, for which they have all the benefits of the harbour, with ample quay accommodation.

MEDICAL ACTS—UNREGISTERED MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is a fact that there are at present a large number of so-called medical practitioners practising in London whose names do not appear on the Medical Register; and, if it is a fact that several persons have been recently poisoned by them; and, if so, what steps will be taken by the Government in the matter?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): There is no information in the Council Office or with the General Medical Council who have been consulted to support the inferences suggested by the Question. There are, no doubt, many unregistered persons practising in London; but there is nothing to show that they pass themselves off as registered medical practitioners. They would, of course, be subject to prosecution if a patient were to die under their hands. It is not, therefore, thought necessary by the Government to take any steps in the matter, though every attention will be given to any specific cases that are brought under notice.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked whether a list could be prepared of unregistered practitioners by whom people had been, or might have been, poisoned?

Sir HENRY HOLLAND said, he would make inquiry; but he did not think it likely that such a list could be furnished.

INDIAN OFFICIALS IN PRIVATE COMPANIES—SIR DONALD STEWART.

General Sir WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is the case that General Sir Donald Stewart, a member of the Indian Council, is also a Director of the "Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Company;" and, if so, whether, considering the supply of machine guns and ammunition for the Indian Service may at any time come under the consideration of the Council, Her Majesty's Government have any intention of calling upon Sir Donald Stewart either to resign his official appointment or to divest himself of an interest in the gun making firm?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): As soon as the Question of the hon. and gallant Member appeared upon the Notice Paper, General Sir Donald Stewart placed himself unreservedly in the hands of the Secretary of State, and has now ceased to be a Director of the "Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Company."

THE TRUCK ACTS—MINES AND WORKS IN SCOTLAND.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that the provisions of the Act 1 and 2 Will. 4, c. 37, and amending Acts, are habitually infringed in various mines and works in Scotland; and, if not so aware, whether he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to prevent further breaches of the Law?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): As soon as the hon. Member gave me Notice of his Question I consulted the Chief Inspector of Factories, who informs me that he is not aware that the provisions of the Truck Acts are habitually infringed in various mines and works in Scotland. He will, however, be in Glasgow next week, and I have directed him to make inquiries as to the specific infringements of the Acts as to which the hon. Member has been good enough to give me private information.

POOR LAW — METROPOLITAN POOR AMENDMENT ACT, 1870—METROPOLIS COMMON POOR FUND.

Mr. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, as the whole question of the Metropolis Common Poor Fund is about to receive his attention, he will agree to refer next Session to a Select Committee the question of the existing inequality of the Poor Rate throughout the Metropolis, with a view to an increase in the grants from the richer to the poorer districts by an extension of the system of the Common Poor Fund?

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) also asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the poor rate in St. George's-in-the-East amounted to 3*s*. 5*d*. in the pound; and, whether the Government would afford him facilities for proceeding with a short Bill to amend the Poor Law Act of 1870?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's), in reply, said, that the whole matter in connection with the Metropolis Common Poor Fund was at present being inquired into by him. He could not make any promise with reference to a Select Committee next Session. After the statement of the Leader of the House as to the Business which would be submitted to it during the current Session, the hon. Member for Bethnal Green would see the impossibility of proceeding with such legislation as he suggested in his Question.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—BEAM TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH.

Mr. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) asked the Secretary for Scotland, If the Fishery Board for Scotland are now satisfied that damage is done to the fishings in the Moray Firth, and to the nets and lines of the fishermen engaged in such fishings, by beam trawlers; whether the Board will make a bye-law prohibiting beam trawling in the Moray Firth; and, whether he will recommend the Scotch Fishery Board to hold an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether such damage is or is not done by trawlers in the Moray Firth, with a view to prohibiting trawling therein?

The SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): The Fishery

Board inform me that they are not satisfied that damage is done to the fishings in the Moray Firth or elsewhere by beam trawling; but they are engaged in a series of experiments with the view, if possible, of settling the question. They further state that no case of damage to the nets and lines of fishermen engaged in fishing in the Moray Firth has been reported to the Board under the Sea Fisheries Act, 1885, and that any complaints, if made, will be duly attended to. Under these circumstances, the Board, as at present advised, do not intend to make a bye-law as suggested.

EGYPT—BRITISH TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN.

MR. JENNINGS (Stockport) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government are aware that great losses are inflcted upon British traders by the refusal of our Military Forces in Upper Egypt to allow merchandise to pass the frontier; that the markets of the Soudan for cotton and other goods, actually ordered from Lancashire and Cheshire to supply the demands of the Natives, are thus practically closed to our merchants; that these merchants have repeatedly undertaken to submit their goods to the closest examination, in order that no war material may be passed through, but that the customers and the traders are still kept apart by British bayonets; and, whether the Government will issue orders which will have the effect of promptly removing these restrictions?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government are well aware of the loss to British trade owing to the blockade of the Soudan; and in the interest of Egypt, as well as of England, they have been very desirous of re-opening commercial intercourse. The object sought is, of course, the pacification of the country; and we have every reason to believe that the stoppage of trade creates a desire for peace. It has been difficult to ascertain whether that desire has become sufficiently strong; but the question is at this moment under careful consideration, and Her Majesty's Government will procure the removal of the restrictions at the earliest moment at which a beneficial result may appear probable.

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—RESIGNATION OF DR. NEWELL.

MR. R. POWER (Waterford) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state the exact date of the resignation of Dr. Newell, late Senior Secretary to the Board of National Education?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Yes; the Commissioners' Report showed that it was the 16th of January last.

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—DISMISSAL OF MR. J. G. FITZGERALD.

MR. R. POWER (Waterford) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, with respect to the case of Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald, late District Inspector under the Board of National Education, any correspondence has taken place between Mr. Trevelyan, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the Board of National Education, in reference to a question regarding Mr. Fitzgerald's alleged wrongful dismissal put by an honourable Member in the year 1884; whether, in consequence of a deputation consisting of eight Members of this House having waited, in May 1885, on the then Chief Secretary (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), to ask for an inquiry into Mr. Fitzgerald's case, any correspondence took place between the Board of National Education and the Chief Secretary; whether, by the Order of the Board of National Education, dated 30th June 1885, all correspondence on the subject of Mr. Fitzgerald's dismissal was ordered to be printed, and a copy furnished to each Commissioner; and, whether the correspondence with the two Chief Secretaries referred to finds no place in the document which was printed; and, if this is so, will he state who is responsible for so important an omission, and will he lay upon the Table a copy of the Board's Order of 30th June 1885, and copies of the correspondence with the two Chief Secretaries, omitted to be printed in compliance with the Order of the Board of National Education?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There is no record, as I am informed, in the Commissioners' Office of any such correspondence as that mentioned in the Question. It would be merely in the form of memoranda of information which would be sent to the Chief Secretary for the time being, showing the facts stated; but a copy of it would not be in the hands of the Commissioners. The official Paper containing a copy of the Order of the 13th of June, 1885, has been laid before the House.

POST OFFICE—FRIENDLY AND BENEFIT SOCIETIES—HEADINGS TO INVOICES.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, having regard to the saving effected for the State by Friendly and Benefit Societies, he sees any objection to the relaxation of the general rule against written matter being inserted in printed circulars intended for the halfpenny post, by permitting a statement of subscriptions in arrear, and other official communications, to be added at the foot of the circular notices summoning lodge and other meetings of such societies?

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will not allow invoices containing the definite article and demonstrative pronoun, when printed at the head of invoices, in connection with various stipulations referring to the goods named in said invoices, to be charged at the rate of one halfpenny, when such heading or notice is wholly "printed and is intended for transmission in identical terms to several persons," seeing that it would be permitted were the heading printed on a separate piece of paper and wrapped up with the invoice?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): The definition of documents admissible at the book rate was very carefully considered when the Act of 1870 was passed, and is laid down in a Treasury Warrant issued under that Act. It would not be in my power to make any change in its terms without further reference to the Treasury. I may say that even under the present conditions there is a very large loss of revenue already incurred in this part of the Service. The subject is, therefore, one which requires much closer examination before I can undertake to propose any change. As regards the Question of the hon. Member for Manchester, I have only just received from him a specimen of the invoice to which he refers; and after I have been able to examine it I will let him know whether the document can be allowed to pass at book rate or not.

LAW AND JUSTICE — IRREGULAR DETENTION AT THE MIDDLESEX SESSIONS.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following report:—

> "Extraordinary action of a chief warder.—Thomas Robert Lesson having been tried at the Middlesex Sessions and acquitted, some time after the verdict of the jury had been recorded, the defendant's counsel informed the court that the defendant was still detained in the cells below for some purpose. Mr. Fletcher: 'Is this so? Send for the chief warder.' The chief warder then came into the dock with Lesson. Mr. Fletcher ordered Lesson to be immediately discharged, and cautioned the warder. The clerk of the court said, 'This is not the first time it has happened.' It was understood that Lesson had been detained in the cells in order that a full description should be taken of his person, notwithstanding the fact that the jury had acquitted him;"

and, whether, if the above report be accurate, he will cause inquiry to be made as to other similar cases, and take such steps to prevent their recurrence, either in the Metropolis or in the Provinces, as he may deem advisable?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): I have obtained a Report from the officer who was in charge of the prisoners at the Sessions referred to. He denies that there was any unnecessary delay, or that Lesson was detained in order to take a description of his person, and he states that the prisoner was discharged within 10 minutes of the verdict being given. He also denies that the clerk of the Court made the remark which is imputed to him. I am not aware of any other similar cases; but if the hon. Member will specify them I will do my best to rectify any abuse that may exist.

ISLANDS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC—THE NEW HEBRIDES—THE CONVENTION WITH FRANCE, 1878.

Sir SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for the

Colonies, Whether he is aware of the breach of the Convention with France, of 1878, regarding the New Hebrides, by the establishment, at Havannah Harbour, Sandwich Islands, on the 1st of June last, by Lieutenant Legrand, of the French man-of-war *Dives*, of a military post, and of the hoisting of the French flag, the issuing of a proclamation, and the landing of troops on that Island; whether, in view of the feeling in Australia concerning the possible extension of the French convict system in the Western Pacific, the Government are prepared to make such representations to the French Government as will ensure that the terms of the Convention of 1878 may be carried out in future; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence between the two Governments on this question, and other Papers relating thereto?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The action of the French officials in the New Hebrides has for some time been under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and representations have been made to the French Government which, as we trust, will speedily place matters upon a satisfactory footing. The negotiations, however, not being yet completed, it would not be possible to lay on the Table at the present moment any of the Correspondence relating to this subject.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—OUTBREAK OF FEVER IN MARYBOROUGH GAOL.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that fever has again broken out in Maryborough Prison; whether, after the outbreak of fever in 1884, water for use within the prison was obtained from the town; and, whether the inmates have now to use the prison water, which is so bad that it has to be boiled and filtered before use?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The General Prisons Board state that three cases of fever have recently occurred in Maryborough Prison. The water in 1884 was obtained from outoutside the prison, but not from the town supply. Early last year the water was analyzed by Sir Charles Cameron, and favourably reported on. The recent order as to boiling and filtering has been given merely as an additional precaution pending a further analysis both of the water from the supply now in use and that from another source which has been suggested.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, if the right hon. Gentleman could say whether the fever was due to the defective sanitary arrangements generally in the prison; and, whether the defective arrangements had not already resulted in the death of one of the warders?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that one of the warders had died of fever.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—DISCIPLINE IN MARYBOROUGH GAOL.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will send an Inspector to Maryborough Prison to inquire into the personal safety of the warders under the system of discipline adopted by the governor, and into the amount of control and guard over the convicts employed outside the prison walls, and also into the escapes and attempts at escape since the convicts were removed to Maryborough?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The prison is regularly visited once a month by an Inspector of the Prisons Board, and also at frequent intervals by their Medical Officer, and by a member of the Board. Nothing has come to the knowledge of the Government or of the Board to suggest the necessity for such a further inquiry as is proposed in the Question; but if the hon. Member has any information on the subject, I shall be obliged if he will communicate it to me.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I will supply the right hon. Gentleman.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—THE NEW 68-TON GUN.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether it is true that at the fourth or fifth round fired from the new 68-ton gun at the proof butts at Woolwich, the "liner" of the gun not only receded from its position, but moved round to such a degree that the groove of the "liner" came opposite to and coincided with the projection in the gun, thereby rendering the gun unserviceable?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The liner was extended slightly towards the breech, and twisted slightly round, but not so that the groove came opposite to the projections in the gun. The firing was continued until the proof was completed. There was no possibility of the gun sustaining any injury from such a cause, and the gun is perfectly serviceable. I am informed that liners always shift a little.

POST OFFICE—ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE FROM GALWAY.

SIR ROPER LETHBRIDGE (Kensington, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the postal communication between Europe and America would not be quickened by the establishment of an Atlantic mail service from Galway, and by the construction of a submarine tunnel between Scotland and Ireland; and, whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the advantage of obtaining, as an alternative to the existing overland route to India, Australasia, and the Far East, an equally expeditious route through British territory, by way of Ireland and British America?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES (Cambridge University): I do not think that the Galway route for mails to America would be any quicker than that of Queenstown; but I may state that tenders have been invited for the conveyance of mails to America to be sent in to the Post Office on the 1st of next month, and that any tender of a service from Galway will be duly considered with others. Some little time could, doubtless, be saved by means of a submarine tunnel between Scotland and Ireland. The attention of Her Majesty's Government has been drawn to the route *viâ* Ireland and British America as a possible route for mails to the far East, and the matter is still under consideration.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—TREATMENT OF NATIVES.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been called to the recently published statements of the Rev. J. B. Gribble and of Mr. D. Carley, of Perth (Western Australia), as to the practical enslavement of Natives in Western Australia; whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the truth of the allegations that Natives are compelled by fraudulent indentures to sign agreements to enter the service of white settlers for specified periods; that they are frequently kidnapped, with a view to being thus "assigned" to settlers; that this "assignment system" is used for obtaining Native women for immoral purposes; that the Natives thus assigned are frequently chained, handcuffed, and subjected to other cruelties, and in many instances have been shot, on attempting to escape from the masters to whom they have thus been fraudulently assigned; and, whether he is in a positien to state that, if these statements are substantiated, the Colonial Office will make immediate representstions to the Government of Western Australia, with the view to promply secure legal and effectual protection for the Natives?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My attention has been called to the recently published statements of the Rev. J. B. Gribble, which had been sent home by the Governor of West Australia. But he adds that in the only alleged case of outrage by a settler against a Native mentioned in those statements as to which he had then received information, it appeared that no white man was concerned in it, and that the offender was duly punished. He was making further inquiry into such other charges as required it; but I ought to add that the subject of outrages by settlers has for some years been the subject of communication with the Governors, and the general result has been to show that there had undoubtedly been exceptional cases of such offences; but that their existence as a system had not been proved. The Governor is fully alive to the importance of the subject, and has reported that he was introducing a Bill under which a Native Board and a system of protectors will be established, and provision will be made to surround the labour engagements of the Natives with every possible precaution. Within the last five minutes I have received a telegram from West Australia which states that the Bill has become law.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—MANUFACTURE OF SHOT AND SHELL.

SIR FREDERICK MAPPIN (York, W.R., Hallamshire) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether cast iron shot and cast iron shell, now manufactured at Woolwich Arsenal, can be purchased from manufacturers in this Country precisely the same in quality as those now supplied at Woolwich; whether he will have tenders issued, to ascertain the prices at which manufacturers will supply cast iron shot and shell to the Arsenal; and, whether, if such prices are less than the cost of making such shell at the Government arsenal, he will take such steps and issue such orders that the time of highly paid officials may be in future better and more profitably employed than at present?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said: The answer to the first paragraph is Yes. Tenders were issued by public advertisement last year, and orders to a considerable extent were given to the trade. The prices of the tenders accepted were, however, slightly higher than the cost of making at the Royal Laboratory. Further orders will depend upon the requirements of the Service.

BURMAH—THE CHIEF BOSHWAY.

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether his attention has been called to the following passage in a recent telegram from *The Times* correspondent at Mandalay:—

> "Boshway, who now requires a brigade to check him, offered to surrender if his life was spared, this was refused, although, since the conquest of Burmah, Boshway does not appear to have committed any crime except fighting against us. Boshway's brother surrendered under the terms of the Amnesty Proclamation, in similar circumstance, and was sentenced to penal servitude for life;"

and, whether this information is accurate, and what instructions the Government of India have issued with reference to the treatment of prisoners taken in engagements between Her Majesty's forces and the people of Upper Burmah?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): There is nothing in the official information which has reached the Secretary of State which in any way confirms the statements of *The Times* Correspondent referred to. All military executions were stopped in Upper Burmah in January last, and prisoners are now dealt with by civil tribunals according to law.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—NUMBERS AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF THE FORCE.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total numerical strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary in officers, sergeants, and constables; and, what is the number of Roman Catholics and of Protestants (distinguishing Episcopalians from Presbyterians) in each of these grades respectively, at the present time?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.) said, the Question only appeared on the Paper that day. He had previously been asked a similar Question by another hon. Member, who had given him Notice of it, and he had asked him to postpone it for a few days. If the hon. Member would postpone his Question until Tuesday he should be able to answer it.

POOR LAW—RATIONS TO OFFICERS IN THE BETHNAL GREEN UNION.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that in the Bethnal Green Union the actual cost of the rations of the workhouse and the school officers (seven principal and sixty-eight subordinate) is twelve shillings and eightpence per head per week, whereas the amount repaid for these rations to the Bethnal Green Union out of the common fund, according to the scale fixed by the Local Government Board, works out at only seven shillings and fivepence halfpenny per head per week, so that in respect of this expense alone Bethnal Green pays over £1,000 per annum in excess of the sum recouped to it; whether the cost per head of officers rations in the Bethnal Green Union fairly represents their average cost throughout the Metropolis; why, seeing that "The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1870," provides that the term "salaries of officers" shall include the cost of the rations of the officers, different rules are applied in the two cases, the Local Government Board allowing the full amount of the salaries, but little more than half the average cost of the rations; and, whether Mr. Goschen, who had charge in this House of the Bill of 1870, then stated that "the principle of the Bill was to equalise the rates as far as possible?"

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's), in reply, said, he had no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the figures quoted by the hon. Member. He stated the other day that at the time the scale was fixed an inquiry was made and a scale fixed which appeared to the Local Government Board approximately to give an average throughout the Metropolis. The question whether or not the amount which was fixed at present was an adequate amount would form part of the investigation which, as he had stated to the House, he was about to make.

ARMY—MR. GUSTENBERG, LIEUTENANT, 20th HUSSARS.

Sir JOHN SIMON (Dewsbury) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether inquiry has been made into the circumstances which led to the resignation of his Commission by Mr. Gustenberg, late a Lieutenant of the 20th Hussars?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): The General Officer Commanding in Egypt was directed on the 14th of August to make an inquiry into all the circumstances of the case, and I have given directions that the Report when it is received shall be brought under my consideration.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he could now state in what order the Estimates would be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): The Government propose to proceed with the Amendment now before the House, and thereafter to proceed with the Estimates—the Army Estimates first, then the Navy and the Civil Service Estimates in their order.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [ELEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment on Motion for an Address [19th August]—[See page 96.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the last paragraph, to add the words—"And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that certain circumstances accountable for the recent outbreak, prolongation, and repeated renewals of riots, raids for plunder, and conflicts with the Forces of the Crown, in Belfast, dictate the necessity for the prompt adoption of special measures for the maintenance of social order there, and that the most imperative and urgent of these measures are, the re-establishment of Her Majesty's authority in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters, the limitation of all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown, in times of public emergency, and adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, to magistrates directly responsible to Her Majesty's Government, and the increase of the local Constabulary Force to such a strength as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency, until Parliament, on consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, can proceed to the application of adequate permanent measures for the protection of life and property in certain quarters of Belfast."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS IN BELFAST—REMEDIAL MEASURES.

Mr. P. McDONALD (Sligo, N.) said, he desired to touch as lightly as possible on the occurrences of which so much had been heard, and which were alluded to with the prejudice and want of information shown in the speech, in the previous day's debate, of the hon. Member for North Belfast (Mr. W. Ewart). The hon. Gentleman stated that the lamentable riots in Belfast were due to a desire on the part of the Protestants of that place to enter a protest against the principle of the repeal of the Union. The hon. Gentleman must be very oblivious to the events of the day, and a very careless reader of the newspapers, to have come to such a conclusion. Was the hon. Gentleman not aware that for the last 40 years the question of the repeal of the Union was not before the country? The hon. Gentleman further enlarged on the hostility of Catholics towards Protestants throughout the country, and to his statements on the subject he begged to give the most unqualified denial. He (Mr. McDonald) defied anyone to point out a single instance where the Catholics of Ireland had in any way interfered with the exercise by the Protestants of their religious duties. As one who knew almost every town in Ireland, he could not call to mind a single case of disagreement between these two religious sections of the people in any matter unconnected with politics. In proof of the truth of his statement, it was hardly necessary to go beyond the House of Commons itself, where on these Benches eight or ten Protestant Irish Members sat in company with their Catholic compatriots. They grasped one another by the hand of friendship and brotherly love, totally regardless of where they bowed the knee on the Sabbath. For Ireland's national objects the question of religious belief was of no consequence whatever. If this wretched sectarian strife of the North, fostered as it was by fanatical preachings for personal or political purposes, be allowed to continue, unquestionably it would long be a blot on the fair fame of Belfast. It was already a disgrace to the town and to the Government which permitted it. The hon. Member for North Belfast said that Catholics in Belfast were not prevented from getting employment in the factories there. It was a fact, however, that in the shipbuilding works of Messrs. Hartland and Wolff there were 6,000 persons employed, of whom there were never more than 200 Catholics. At the time of the outbreak of the riots there were only 28, and even they were compelled to leave out of regard to their personal safety. That was a state of things which no responsible Government should permit. Undue importance should not be attached to Orange processions — they consisted of little more than organized tomfoolery. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) had clearly shown that undoubtedly the real cause of the riots was the incitement of the people by two reverend firebrands—the Rev. Dr. Kane and the Rev. "Roaring" Hanna, whose efforts were supplemented by the speeches of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill). The noble Lord told the Belfast Orangemen that they must do something that would "rivet the attention of the English democracy." If the Protestants of Ulster were left alone the processions would pass off quietly as mere social recreations; but the incitements of men having influence over them naturally led to deplorable riots such as those that had occurred. The whole of the riotous proceedings was a scandal to civilization, and it was the duty of the Government to have suppressed them at their very inception. The Chancellor of the Exchequer he did not consider the only fomenter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) shared in the evil work of inciting to disorder. That Gentleman had written a letter virtually advising the Orangemen not to wait for the passing of a certain law, but to rise in arms. It was not to be wondered at that riots should follow such a course of conduct as this. The local magistracy of Belfast had erred grievously. They had stood by silent and inactive whilst the disorder and riot were raging around them. It had been stated with a great deal of truth that 500 men of the Dublin Metropolitan Police with their batons would soon have stopped the Belfast disturbance. But the police had not been allowed to use their batons, as they had been held back by their officers, possibly with the best intentions; and it was only after the riots had had full swing, the houses of Catholics been wrecked, and the police stoned and besieged in their barracks, that the men had been allowed to defend themselves. In the face of this, an hon. Gentleman had the hardihood of making a suggestion that Belfast should have local police such as they had had in 1864. In that force there had only been one Catholic. He thought that they were not likely to fall back upon the establishment of such a force. He recommended to the Government that they should give Belfast a force such as Dublin had—an impartial mixed force, headed by an independent and impartial officer. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had announced his intention of consulting the Mayor and local magistrates of Belfast. The Irish Party thoroughly appreciated and recognized the conciliatory manner of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and they would reciprocate the good feeling. But, in the face of strong evidence to the contrary, they could not admit that the Mayor of Belfast—a public benefactor, no doubt—was utterly innocent of the charges brought against him. If the Government took their information from, and followed the advice of, the Mayor and Magistracy of Belfast, they would soon find themselves in a sea of trouble. He was desirous, like each Member of his Party, for the maintenance of social order, and would again suggest that the Dublin system—which worked well—should be enforced in Belfast. In Dublin two Resident Divisional Magistrates performed the functions of justice, the City Justices not exercising any control, in order to prevent the stain of partiality or any unfairness. With regard to the amount of loss of life and property in Belfast, he was desirous to know on whom the burden of compensation would fall? If it fell on the local rates, were the Catholics — who were the victims of Orange outrages — to pay for being victimized? He would suggest to Belfast the example of the town of Sligo. In Sligo it had happened that when the Catholics had discovered that miscreants of their own creed had injured Protestant property a Catholic fund was raised to make good the damage. This was a worthy example for Belfast to follow. In conclusion, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary not to wait for the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, but to at once act upon the suggestion which he had taken the liberty of throwing out with regard to the local magistracy—namely, for the immediate introduction of a magisterial system in Belfast similar to that in Dublin—and, by so doing, take the surest means to stamp out outrage and restore order in that part of Ireland.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said, that this debate on the Address had now lasted a considerable time, and during its course many speeches of varied excellence had been delivered. He thought that when the debate was studied in the country, as no doubt a debate of such importance would be, the value that would be given to the speeches which had been made would mainly depend upon how much light they threw or how much information they afforded to the British public as to the probability of success that might attend the efforts of Her Majesty's Government to restore law and order in Ireland, and finally to settle the Irish Question. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said that the question of Ireland was the question of the day; but he might have said of the days—for all days were occupied with the Irish Question. But a smile flickered across the face of the late Prime Minister when he made the remark, and that smile, perhaps, indicated that the Government in undertaking to settle the Irish Question had undertaken a job they would find great difficulty in accomplishing. Ireland had been the question of the hour for many years, a kind of political *pons asinorum* which Government after Government had set themselves to solve, and instead of the Governments settling the Irish Question, as a rule the Irish Question had settled them. The Government had left nothing to be desired in the statements they had made as to the methods they proposed to adopt to settle this question. Their statements had been clear and distinct, and the majority of the House, of whatever Party, would wish them well in undertaking this difficult and almost insoluble task. The only speech from the Front Opposition Bench which dealt with the whole Irish policy of the Government was that of the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), of whom it was difficult to say what position he held in the House. In the absence of his Leader the right hon. Gentleman was leading the English Separatist Party, and the difficulty in criticizing his speech was to know whether to treat him as a serious politician. The right hon. Gentleman found fault with the method the Government proposed to adopt to restore law and order in Ireland; and the House was now considering the methods the Government proposed to adopt to restore law and order in Belfast. ["Question!"] Surely it was the question to discuss the objections of the right hon. Gentleman to the methods of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had the rhetorical misfortune to get hold of a sentence that exactly fitted his mouth—he stuck to it like a man; he repeated it 21 times—and the sentence was that "social order is to be treated absolutely by itself;" the words "social order" being occasionally varied by the words "social disorder." The right hon. Gentleman made the discovery that treating social order by itself was a distinguishing characteristic of Tory Government, and he found fault with the Government for proposing to do so, and said that was the difference between Liberal and Tory policies. Personally, he had tried to discover the difference between the policy of the Tory Party and that of the Liberal Party, but had always failed; and, as far as he could make out—until he heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman—the difference was not in measures, but in the men who were to carry them into effect. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Tories had inscribed on their banners "Social order to be treated absolutely by itself." He supposed the right hon. Gentleman would support the proposal to withdraw the police from Belfast. The right hon. Gentleman said you ought to withdraw the cause before you attempted to deal with the effect. It was stated that bad feeling existed at Belfast as regarded the police, and that the result was that violent and unwarrantable attacks were made upon the members of that body; so that if you withdrew that body, according to the right hon. Gentleman, you would take away the cause of the irritation that had provoked the riots. For half-an-hour the right hon. Gentleman told the House that the Government's policy in Ireland could not succeed because they proposed to treat social order by itself; and he concluded by saying that the only remedy for the state of Ireland was to grant her a separate Parliament. Since when had the right hon. Gentleman held that opinion? How came it about that in the course of a few months he performed such an astounding political caper? In the month of December he said that the worst possible wish he could offer for his opponents—the Nationalists—was that they might stew in "Parnellite juice."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. and gallant Gentleman is not speaking to the Amendment before the House. The question of social order throughout Ireland is not the subject under discussion. The Amendment refers to the special measures to be taken for the maintenance of social order in Belfast.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said, he would proceed to deal with the Amendment. It was moved by the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton), who was not the Member for West Belfast, who was not the Member for South Sligo, but who was a Member of the House of Commons. There was not much in the Amendment. It was merely a peg on which to hang a speech attacking the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), himself (Colonel Saunderson), and others. The speech might be divided into two parts. The last part was much the smaller part, and it was devoted to Belfast. The first part was a much larger part. Three-quarters of it was devoted to the outrageous, scandalous, and criminal conduct of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Irishmen who held similar views to his (Colonel Saunderson's). According to the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton), they had acted in a manner that was absolutely detestable and criminal. With the permission of the House, he would, first of all, deal with the question of Belfast, and then answer the charges made against himself. His noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer could answer for himself, and was well able to fight his own battle. In doing so he (Colonel Saunderson) would ask the indulgence of the House. It might be possible that, in defending himself against the charges that had been made by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) and those who thought with him, he might wander slightly, and travel outside the framework of the Amendment. He was sure, however, that even his opponents would admit that when a Minister of the House had been violently attacked, and his conduct impugned, he had a fair right, at any rate, to try to explain. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sexton) said that the Ministers of the present Government were the cause of the bloodshed, the crime, and the confusion that existed in Belfast. He (Colonel Saunderson) must say that he thought it a wonderful thing that the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) did not speak longer on the previous day. He only spoke for two hours. When they came to think that the greater portion of his speech had been simmering and bubbling inside him since last spring—

and no doubt he had devoted some time to adding to and improving it—the only wonder was that he did not speak for a much longer period. He devoted part of his speech to the question of Belfast, and he would deal with that part of it now. The House would see at once that to deal with the question at the present moment was a very difficult one. He had no objection to go into details, and meet objections; but assertions made on one side of the House to be met by counter-assertions on the other side of the House would not enlighten the public mind much. A Public Commission was about to sit which would receive sworn evidence, and he thought it would not be wise for anyone to prejudice the matter. In point of fact, there were trials to take place, and any statement that might be made might have the effect of prejudicing the cases before the Court. The police of Belfast had come in for a considerable share of abuse. He did not wish at all to say anything to the House that would pre-judge the question; but, having been in Belfast immediately after the riots, and having carefully examined the question as far as he could examine it, he had come to the conclusion that when the Commission of Inquiry sat and took evidence on oath, they would find it clearly shown that a great deal of reckless firing took place at Belfast on the part both of the police and the unfortunate population. The House, however, would take into consideration the state of mind of the people of Belfast, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, at the time the riots took place. They had been excited on the one side to high prospect of attaining Home Rule, and, on the other side, had the prospect of being handed over to the tender mercies of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. The population of Belfast was notoriously an excitable population. He was sorry to say that for many years the Roman Catholic population and the Protestant population of Belfast had been on anything but good terms. At the same time, the riots that broke out were not altogether attributable to that. No one regretted more deeply than he did these riots, and what had occurred. [*Laughter and cries of* "Order, order!"] He could quite understand the derision from the other side. But who was answerable for the condition of feeling of the population of Belfast, and their being driven to a condition of political madness? The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) had said that it was the fault of Members on the Ministerial side; but to his (Colonel Saunderson's) mind the riots in Belfast were the bloodstained legacy that had been inherited from the late Government. To his mind, blood had tracked the course of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) from Khartoum to Belfast. But he must say that he considered that the population of Belfast had met with immense provocation. He did not excuse the violence and outrage committed; but, at the same time, he asked the English people to suspend their judgment until they had heard the evidence which would be given on oath, and until the Commission had reported the result of their inquiry. Then, and then only, could the House be able to come to a just and accurate decision. The hon. Member for Sligo mentioned one of the cases of outrage—the case of an old man who was tarred—as a joke, whereas it was about one of the most barbarous and disgraceful outrages. A newspaper of Belfast followed the very bad example, and also called it a practical joke, But the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) spoke of the dynamite explosion at Salford, where life was lost, as a practical joke. The hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) had also referred in terms of disapprobation to Orangemen. He mixed them up with the riots at Belfast. Now, he (Colonel Saunderson) absolutely denied that the Orangemen of Belfast had anything to do with the riots at Belfast. He did not deny that Protestants had something to do with the matter; but the people that were the chief rioters in the Belfast disturbances were what they called "Corner Boys." They were absolutely beyond all control. They were the roughs, such as undoubtedly existed in Belfast and in all other large towns. The Orangemen did all in their power to arrest the riots. The Grand Master of Belfast (Dr. Kane) was a personal friend of his own. He was proud to acknowledge that Dr. Kane was one of his friends, and a very respected one. He issued a manifesto to the Orangemen of Belfast, begging them to do all in their power to promote peace, and, as far as they could, to influence the minds of those outside the Order to arrest the violence and disorder. So much for that accusation. Another point with the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) appeared to be that Orangemen were in the habit of taking a terrific oath, which oath bound them to exterminate the Roman Catholics. [MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): Hear, hear!] The hon. Member, no doubt, believed it, but he had been grossly misinformed. No such oath ever existed, or anything in the slightest degree resembling it, and no such oath now had any existence. The very opposite was the case, for every Orange Lodge meeting was opened with prayer. ["Oh, oh!" *and laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh if they liked, because they were ignorant, but those who had had the privileges as he had had of a knowledge of Orangeism would know that every Orange Lodge was opened with prayer. [*Laughter* and *cheers.*] Well, he thought prayer was not a subject to laugh at. One of the prayers used in Orange Lodges was to the effect that Roman Catholics might be rescued from the errors of their ways. He now turned to the speeches of other hon. Members who had followed on the same side, but less eloquently than the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton). They accused the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, himself (Colonel Saunderson), and others holding the same opinions, of inciting the people of Ireland to civil war if the Parliament of England did not make the laws to please them.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): No, if they made laws to displease them.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: Well, that was very much the same. A challenge had been thrown down by hon. Members opposite that they should repeat in that House the language they had employed in Ulster. He would at once take up the challenge of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon). He would repeat any words that he had ever used in Ireland, and if similar circumstances arose he would use them again. He should now explain the course he and his Friends felt it their duty to take. No one, he hoped, would ever be able to accuse him of saying one thing in Ulster and another in the House of Commons. He and his Friends denied—and he had said it already in that House—they denied that the House of Commons had a right—they did not say that it had not the power, for it could pass any law it pleased—to separate Ireland from England, and hand her over to a foreign Government. Perhaps he would be allowed to show that a foreign Government was in reality what an Irish Parliament sitting in Dublin would be. A very distinguished Irishman—Mr. Davitt—in Chicago recently made use of the following observations about the Home Rule Bill of the late Government. He said—

> "Mr. Gladstone, the English Minister who, in 1881, sent to gaol without trial no fewer than 1,000 members of the Land League, now fathered a Bill which, if successful, would have made those very men—the same ex-suspects—the practical rulers of their country."

Well, the Loyalists of Ireland objected to be governed by an Administration of gaol-birds. Some people might be persuaded by the clamour of its advocates to grant Home Rule; but the Loyalists absolutely refused to recognize such a Government, or to consent to an Administration being created in Dublin from hon. Gentlemen opposite below the Gangway. At any rate, while they had strength enough in their right hands they would do what they could to prevent such a Government ruling over them. From the Opposition side of the House he and other Members had been arraigned for having directly incited to bloodshed and civil war in Belfast, and he was going to show the House that they as Loyalists were perfectly justified in what they had said, and he would ask the country to judge fairly between them and their accusers. What was going on at the present moment? What was the policy of the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway? It was not a British policy, but a foreign policy for the dismemberment of the British Empire, a policy paid for and subsidized by foreign money. When he made that statement before he excited a frightful explosion below the Gangway. Hon. Gentlemen seemed to think they had been insulted. Nothing of the kind. He did not object to their being paid if their paymasters thought they were worth it. He was, therefore, perfectly justified in looking on them as foreign delegates paid by foreign money. On the authority of one of the hon. Members below the Gangway, he would show that the Nationalists professed a foreign policy, and that it was promoted by foreign money. He was not in the habit of making random statements, and he would back up what he said by an extract from a speech made by the hon. Member for South Tipperary (Mr. John O'Connor) at a meeting of the Cork National League, just before the Election in 1885. The hon. Member made the following statement:—

> "There was a general impression that the new Members of the Party serving in Parliament were to be paid for their service. They ought to be very cautious, and not rest their hopes too strongly upon this, lest they might not be fulfilled. He (Mr. O'Connor) knew Mr. Parnell's mind on the subject, and he would say that he wanted to return 90 Members of three classes. The first class would be independent Members, who would be able to maintain themselves in London; then the second class would be men who could afford to come to London and vote on special and particular occasions; while the third class would be composed of men of transcendental ability, who would have their expenses paid in London. Mr. Parnell paid these men out of the National League funds raised abroad."

He (Colonel Saunderson) quoted this in order to substantiate the position he had taken up when he said that he and his Friends would not have these men to reign over them. He submitted that those hon. Gentleman, consisting of the first, second, and third classes, were carrying out a foreign policy. He did not know who were the men of transcendental ability who were paid; but two of them who had lost their seats, especially Mr. William O'Brien and Mr. Healy, were to have places found for them. ["Hear, hear!"] That was a very weak "Hear, hear!" indeed; and perhaps there was a natural jealousy on the Benches opposite of their superior ability. Probably it came from hon. Members who were trembling in their shoes lest they should have to immolate themselves in order to make room for Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Healy. Some hon. Members were able to live in Colorado or Paris out of the funds; but the large proportion of the hon. Gentlemen who formed the Nationalist Party were not considered worth their keep in London. Therefore he consinered that he had made out his case; and when he asserted that the Party opposite was a foreign Party, and that they were paid by foreign money, he thought he did not make a rash assertion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must inform the hon. and gallant Member that he is not speaking at all to the question before the House. The hon. and gallant Gentleman must remember that the question before the House has reference to the Belfast riots, and not to the general terms of the Address.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said, he was quite aware of the fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I must call upon the hon. and gallant Member to observe the ruling of the Chair.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I bow to your ruling at once, Sir. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Sexton) had charged him with having incited to civil war.

MR. SEXTON: Not to civil war, but to rebellion, as I understand it.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said, that he repeated and distinctly stated in Ireland that if the House of Commons passed a law and handed him, and those who thought with him, over to the tender mercies of hon. Gentlemen opposite, on the whole they would be justified in the last resort of appealing to force. He repeated that statement again now in the House of Commons. He most distinctly stated that in his opinion the House of Commons had no right to snap asunder the bonds of union which connected one part of the Empire with the other against the will of a considerable portion of the people of Ireland.

MR. SEXTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. I beg to ask you, Sir, whether an hon. Member of this House is in Order in declaring that, in the event of a certain law being passed by this House, he and his followers would be entitled to resort to arms against it?

MR. SPEAKER: What has fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman does not call for my intervention.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I think, Sir, that we ought to know whether an hon. Member is entitled to say that if this House and the Parliament pass a certain law which is disliked by a considerable portion of the people of a country, that those people would be justified in resorting to force? This is a most important question, and it would be as well if both sides of the House were to understand whether such language was permissible.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.) said: I rise, Sir, to a point of Order. I would ask, Sir, whether it is not the practice of this House—a custom dating from time immemorial—when any question is raised on words used by any hon. Member, and to which objection has been taken, whether it is not the proper course that a Motion be made that the words be taken down?

MR. SPEAKER: I desire to point out that the question raised does scarcely refer to Parliamentary Order. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) asks me to say if the words used by the hon. and gallant Gentleman were in Order. The words used by the hon. and gallant Gentleman were that in the event of a certain measure passing he would think it necessary to have recourse to a particular line of action. That is clearly not a point on which I can interfere, because it has nothing whatever to do with the debates in this House.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON resuming, said, that he absolutely denied that he made use of the words attributed to him by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt). He had stated distinctly that it was only on one point, he believed, that he should feel justified in employing force in a certain contingency, and he believed that hon. Gentlemen opposite would in similar circumstances do the same. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: No.] Perhaps not on the present occasion; but then the right hon. Gentleman changed his mind so quickly. The reason he (Colonel Saunderson) employed the language in the House of Commons which he had used in Ireland was because he felt bound, as an honest man, to repeat in the House that which he had used on the other side of the Channel, and which hon. Gentlemen opposite stated that they saw the disastrous results of in the Belfast riots. He denied this. He was prepared, if need be, to defend his words in that House. He was afraid that he had already detained the House of Commons too long; but he would repeat that he did use those expressions in Ulster and now repeated them here; but he absolutely denied that any words of his, or any of his Friends, had had any effect whatever in influencing the actions of the Belfast mobs. The Belfast mob was not under their control; it acted upon laws of its own. He most earnestly hoped that one result of the action of Her Majesty's Government would be to teach the Belfast mob, whether Protestant or Catholic, that the law must be obeyed in Belfast as in other parts of Ireland. He thanked the House—and especially hon. Gentlemen opposite from Ireland—for the hearing it had accorded him. It was always willing to listen to anyone who could contribute anything to the subject under discussion, and he was tolerably well informed on the unfortunate question under debate; and he could assure the House that although there might be many in Ireland who held views diametically opposed to theirs and in favour of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), yet there was a great section of the population in Ireland who were just as loyal and determined to maintain the authority of the Crown and of the law in Ireland as were to be found in any other part of Her Majesty's Empire.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I am sure, Sir, that we all regret very much the unkindly circumstances, whatever they were, which brought the speech of the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Saunderson) to what looked something rather like an untimely and premature end. We could all very well understand that the line of argument which the hon. and gallant Member was pursuing could not be very pleasing in the ears of his Leaders, who have persistently since the beginning of the Session—I am sorry to say not always before—urged the discussion of Irish subjects in a tone of moderation and of legality. We cannot quite part company with the hon. and gallant Member without taking note of one very astonishing announcement which he ventured to make on the floor of the British House of Commons. That announcement was nothing less than this—and I, for one, entirely recognize and cordially respect the hon. and gallant Member's courage in making it here, as in Ulster—that if Parliament passed, and the Sovereign assented to, an Act in reference to the government of Ireland which did not commend itself to that portion of the population—[*Cries of* "No!" *and* "Yes!"] [Mr. SEXTON: What else?] Well, Sir, I will gladly give the hon. and gallant Member the opportunity of repeating what he did say.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I was speaking of government by a foreign Power. I said, "to hand us over to a foreign Power."

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: That is a mere quibble. I do not care what the object of the Act of Parliament concerned is. What the hon. and gallant Member said was this—that if Parliament passed, and the Sovereign assented to, an Act, whatever its object might be, to which a portion of the population, through its spokesmen, did not approve—[Colonel Saunderson dissented]—I should be honestly anxious not to misrepresent what the hon. and gallant Member said; he has said no more in effect than what was recommended by the noble Lord. [Lord Randolph Churchill: Hear, hear!] The hon. and gallant Gentleman is popular in the House, and I, for one, should be sorry to see any misfortune befall him. I warn him, however, that the language he has used is the language not of civil war, as he supposes, but the language of a rebel. I do not mean to say that the hon. and gallant Member nourishes thoughts of rebellion in the depths of his heart, but I do say that the course of conduct he has pledged himself to undertake is flat rebellion; and if he ever ventures to make his words good, I am very much afraid that he will meet with the fate and come within the description which he applied to hon. Members below the Gangway—he will become a gaol-bird. Now, I pass from that rather painful episode to a lover of legality like myself to the remarks which the hon. and gallant Member made upon the topic more immediately before the consideration of the House. He began by deprecating statements and counter-statements on the details and circumstances of the recent riots at Belfast. He did not very fairly observe his own canon; but he immediately proceeded to charge the police with reckless firing. I submit to him that that is making a statement which, if representatives of the police were here, they would contradict. That is a matter not only before the Royal Commission, but is one which the Courts of Law will have to determine, and on which the liberties of many of Her Majesty's subjects—and even the liberties of some of these police—may depend. The hon. and gallant Member made two other very extraordinary remarks, the more extraordinary because they were mutually destructive. He said that the real cause of the riots in Belfast was the production of the Home Rule Bill. Then he went on to say that the riots were really the work of the "Corner Boys" of Belfast. Well, then, it comes to this—that the only politicians in Belfast who were so affected by our proposed legislation that they resorted to rioting by way of protest were the "Corner Boys." I leave it to the hon. and gallant Gentleman to reconcile these two statements as best he can. But does the hon. and gallant Member perceive the proposition that really underlies his contention? Why, it comes to this, that we ought not to have brought in our Home Rule Bill because it led to riots in Belfast. The meaning of the hon. and gallant Member is, that although Parliament in its wisdom might think that a measure of self-government for Ireland was expedient on broad, national, and Imperial grounds, yet that they ought not to pass such a measure because it might lead to rioting by the "Corner Boys" of Belfast. In that case what is to become of the supremacy of Parliament? Are mobs in Ireland to be the arbiters of the wisdom of Parliament? That is what the hon. and gallant Member's argument comes to? Supposing that the Nationalist mob in Dublin or Cork were to take the law into their own hands by murderous onslaughts upon the forces of the Crown, would that be a reason why we should bring in a Home Rule Bill? The hon. and gallant Gentleman—quoting a speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt)—said he had been puzzled to know what was the difference between the Liberal and the Tory Party. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has an advantage over some of us, because he has belonged to both Parties; and while I do not doubt that his conversion is sincere, yet he ought not to have forgotten the fact when he commented on the changes of view of some of his hon. Friends. There is one point, at all events, upon which there is no difference between the Liberal Party and the Tory Party in this House, and that is in their resolution to maintain order and to enforce the law. A great deal has been said, not, indeed, in this House, but out of it, in the North of Ireland, as to the want of nerve and energy of the late Government, and as to their vacillation and various other shortcomings. Even more criminal motives than mere weakness have been attributed to them by hon. Members of the House, who are not now present to repeat the statements which they were not ashamed to make in Ulster and elsewhere. Where is the hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. Johnston)? The hon. Member, on an early night in the Session, in a very short speech—which I expected to hear repeated on a more serious occasion—told us that there was a deliberate conspiracy on the part of the police and others to discredit the fair fame of Belfast and to massacre the Protestants? I think an hon. Gentleman who makes a statement of that kind should be prepared to stand by it, and should not disappear, as the hon. Member has done, without bringing forward any sort of evidence in support of his charge. It is idle sophistry to suggest that the late Government were disqualified from keeping order in Belfast by reason of their views in regard to the present system of government in Ireland. Whatever our views may have been as to the best form of government for Ireland, there never was any doubt in the mind of any Member of the late Executive as to the propriety of keeping order in Belfast or anywhere else. Our policy with respect to the riots was a simple one — it was the same as that which is now being pursued by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), and it was the same that would have to be pursued by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) if he were a Chief Minister in his own country. Every Government must do its best to keep the peace and to put down disturbance, and in those respects I do not think that the late Government has done worse than could be expected, taking into consideration all the difficulties with which they had to contend. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has attributed the riots to the Home Rule Bill; but he seems to have forgotten that there were riots in Belfast before the Home Rule Bill was thought of. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, to whose fair and straightforward recognition of what we did I wish to do the fullest justice, did make one little criticism yesterday which I should like to answer. The right hon. Baronet said he was afraid we had not consulted as constantly as was desirable the Local Authorities in Belfast. Now, I would remind the House that Local Authorities in Belfast are not exactly the same as Local Authorities in an English borough of corresponding magnitude and importance. The Corporation is returned by a very restricted franchise, amounting to only some 4,000 electors in a population of 220,000, whereas in England the number of electors would have been from 25,000 to 30,000. There is also an enormous difference between the position of a local magistrate in a town like Belfast, where party feeling and passion has run by tradition to the most violent heights, and the position of magistrates in an English borough, where things are quieter, and the Justices are never so sharply suspected of partizanship and faction. This difference would naturally induce the Executive to hesitate before placing extraordinary power in the hands of the Belfast authorities. I have not a word to say against the honour and uprightness of Sir Edward Harland and his brother magistrates associated with him; but hon. Members opposite will recognize the fact that they belong to the class mainly identified with one set of political interests in the borough. It will be seen, therefore, that it is difficult to give that weight and authority to magistrates who belong to one class and are mainly identified with one sect in the borough, which we should give to our English magistrates rightly. Nobody has proposed to pay much deference to the Local Authorities in Dublin or Cork. We paid as much deference to the Local Authorities of Belfast as you do to those of Dublin. My own confidence in the judgment of the local magistrates was much shaken when, on the first night of my arrival in Dublin, on the occasion of the June riots, a telegram was received at the Castle from the local magistrates of Belfast urging the necessity of withdrawing the extra force of Constabulary. That was in itself a very curious recommendation, and it was made against the advice and counsel of our own responsible, experienced, and efficient officers. There were cases afterwards in which the advice of the magistrates was taken, and the Constabulary were on various occasions, in compliance with their recommendations, withdrawn; but I believe in almost every case where that counsel was followed the result to the public order was most disastrous. There was one point of our action for which we were specially reproached and attacked in the Town Councils of Belfast, and that was because we extended the proclamation under the Arms Act against the possession as well as carrying of arms, without previously asking the advice of the local magistrates. But, Sir, that proclamation was issued on the 19th of July, and on the 14th of that month, or five days earlier, there had been a meeting of the local magistrates, who had discussed the proposal for so extending the proclamation. The magistrates, after consultation, deliberately rejected a proposition to recommend the taking of such a step, and therefore we knew perfectly well, without going through what would have been the empty formality of consulting them, what advice they would give. We had to choose between accepting their advice and acting upon the advice of our own responsible officials, the Resident Magistrates stationed at Belfast, the Inspectors of Constabulary, and the Town Inspectors. I think I have now disposed, as well as I am able, of the charge that we neglected the Local Authorities. I should like to assure the House that our officers in Belfast were particularly instructed, by a minute sent to the two Resident Magistrates, that it was the Lord Lieutenant's strong desire that those gentlemen and the Divisional Magistrates should act "in conjunction with the Mayor and Magistrates and with the co-operation of the Military Authorities." I believe that the further this inquiry goes the more absolutely clear will our hands be found to be of any dereliction of duty in this particular respect. I do not suppose that the right hon. Baronet really intended to make any serious charge against us in respect to this point. But there is one other charge more personal to myself upon which I should wish to say a word or two. Yesterday afternoon the right hon. Baronet frankly repudiated, and advised hon. Members to banish from their minds, the thought that I or the Lord Lieutenant had anything to do with drafting Catholic police from certain special districts into Belfast with malevolent designs. Although the right hon. Baronet has repudiated it, I am sure that this ludicrous, this grotesque calumny will continue to be repeated, as is clear from the report made by a Mr. Patton, the agent, I think, of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, reproduced in *The Times*, which, no doubt, will command very wide credence. He states that a permanent official told him that the Protestants were much more enraged with the police than the Catholics; and when he asked him the reason, the official said that it was to a great extent owing to the opinion of the Orangemen—not the "Corner Boys" only—"that Mr. Morley had picked out Catholic police to go to Belfast to exterminate them." That, he believed, might be described as "the universal belief of the Protestant democracy." I have always heard a great deal of the intelligence of the Belfast community; but, from my own experience of them, I shall have to think that there is with their intelligence a large dose of stupid and malignant credulity. And that credulity is by no means confined to rough and ignorant men. Mr. Reed, the Inspector General of Constabulary, was desired by the right hon. Baronet to go to Belfast. He went, and had an interview with the Mayor and Magistrates. I saw in the papers that he had to assure the magistrates that he had received no orders from the Government as to the selection of the counties from which police were to be drafted into Belfast. I understand that Mr. Reed actually found considerable difficulty in persuading even responsible men like the magistrates of Belfast that I had not ordered Catholic policemen to be drafted into the town to make a sort of Bartholomew massacre in the streets of Belfast. I thought it due to myself that I should say this much in positive denial of any charges so absurd. I hope now we have heard the last of that truly ridiculous statement. We are told more seriously that we ought not to have had any importation of police from the outside, and that the importation of outside police was justly resented. Where were we to get the police from if not from the outside? On the occasion of the July anniversaries, and particularly with the General Election in prospect, there were many districts, especially in the North, where special precautions were needed. In Londonderry, in Armagh, in Omagh, and Portadown, I think, nearly 600 extra police were employed, and we did not think it prudent to weaken the Constabulary force in the North. Where were we to get the extra police from, except from counties outside Ulster? I know it is said that we ought to have resorted exclusively to troops. But is it seriously to be said that, because a portion of the inhabitants of a city do not like the police doing the work of the police, it is the business of the Executive to send troops in their place? I am speaking in the presence of many officers of Her Majesty's Army, and I do not believe there is one who will not bear me out that all experience shows that soldiers are not always the best fitted for police work, and that police work is not well fitted for soldiers. Emergency upon emergency arose in Belfast, and we were bound to resort to troops; but it is ridiculous to contend that the moment the police force of a town is inadequate, you ought at once to employ troops and not constabulary. Where are you going to stop? Supposing the Nationalists in Cork objected to the red coats just as the Protestants in Belfast object to the green coats, what are you going to do? Are you going to give soldiers or police as may be desired, to suit the fastidious preferences of rival mobs? I think all this is a spurious kind of argument, and I apologize for bringing it before the House. The matter has not been referred to in the House; but it has been made use of so much out of the House that I have thought it necessary, however spurious the argument may be, to say something on the matter. Anyone who has read the papers must have seen that the town police were on many occasions treated quite as badly by the mobs in Belfast as the country police. Some of the worst cases of merciless stoning were those in which the victims were the town police. At that fatal affair of the 8th of June, when so many people were killed by the firearms of the police from the Shankill Barracks, there were in the barracks and among the men incriminated a considerable number of the town police. As throwing some light upon the particular frame of mind, not only of the rough classes, but of the more educated in Belfast, I should like to read an extract from a newspaper hostile to the policy of the late Government and to myself. This paper, *The Northern Whig*, referred to the ridiculous charge that we had imported police to exterminate the Protestants, and said that if this point, that the police were honestly drafted into the town, could only be impressed upon the minds of the Protestant population, it could not but have some effect in calming their irritation. It said that at present they were acting from an erroneous notion, and it might be observed that the outcry was raised, not against the country police only, but against any police force whatever. It went on to say that—

> "It was ridiculous to assume that there would be no more riots in the town if there were no more policemen, and it was extraordinary that men of respectable position and education should encourage such delusions."

These are difficulties which any Government, whether Conservative or Liberal, will have to deal with in keeping order in Belfast. Then, again, the allegation is made that the police acted hostilely to the mob, and I wish to make an observation with reference to the speech of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell). The hon. Member went through the story now under examination, and gave the House a great deal of unverified evidence and unsifted allegations with reference to the conduct of the police. Among other things, he made some sort of excuse for the view that the police had acted in a violent manner. The hon. Member endeavoured to show that the chief cause of these riots was the Chief Secretary himself—the unworthy individual who is now addressing the House. The hon. Member is not the only person who has endeavoured to fasten upon me some responsibility for the conduct of the police in consequence of my political views. A friend of the hon. Member, Dr. Kane, in a contribution of some kind he has made somewhere or other, said—

> "The police and the Resident Magistrates easily catch the spirit of the Chief Secretary, especially if there be a touch of Satan in it."

This is the representative of the meek spirit of the Gospel! He has threatened me once, I believe, with physical and corporeal annihilation if I ever should venture to cross the Boyne. But when a Gentleman in the position of the hon. Member for South Tyrone——

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): As the right hon. Gentleman has referred to me, I feel bound to say that the only occasion yesterday on which I used the name of the right hon. Gentleman was when I said it was strongly felt that the police believed there would very soon be a change of masters, and that some of them, under the influence of that belief, had resorted to measures which they would not otherwise have adopted. I made no charge, and should be ashamed to make any reflection, upon the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I am quite sure that the hon. Gentleman did not wish to say anything painful to me personally; but the House will observe that what he said just now comes exactly to the very same thing. What the hon. Member said was, that the fact of the Office of Chief Secretary being filled by me, was in itself a source of demoralization to the police and magistrates. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Ministerial Benches.*] Then the hon. Member does assert that my political opinions were calculated to demoralize the police? [*Ministerial cheers.*] You cheer that assertion; but I venture to say that there is no responsible official now connected with the Government of Ireland, from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) downwards, who would say that there is one atom more of demoralization among the police and magistrates to-day, than there was on the first day I took Office. I felt it to be my business constantly to keep my finger, as it were, on the pulse of the Irish Constabulary, and I lost no opportunity of knowing where there was the slightest sign of demoralization. I always heard that neither in the Royal Irish nor in the Metropolitan Constabulary were to be found any of those results which the hon. Gentleman imputes to my unfortunate presence at Dublin Castle. I must remind the hon. Gentleman that his contention was that the Loyalists of Belfast were justified in attacking the police, because they suspected the police of being the agents of a Government that was in favour of Home Rule. That is a novel doctrine which I hope will not go far. It is shameful to look leniently upon such lawless, wanton, and brutal attacks on the agents of the Queen and the guardians of the peace, as those—whether perpetrated by Protestants or Catholics—simply because they choose to look with disfavour upon the political views of the Chief Secretary of the day. The hon. Gentleman used some language of compliment to the bravery of the Belfast "Corner Boys." I myself should prefer to reserve any compliments for bravery for the police. I should say there is much more bravery in a handful of men putting their backs to a wall and defending themselves, as the police did, than in thousands of "Corner Boys" or men pouring down upon them with deadly missiles. The bravery was not on the side of the mob, but on the side of the police who resisted them; and I think hon. Gentlemen opposite, in spite of Party differences, will agree with me that it is a mistake to give credit to mobs for breaking the law and for defying the police, and to deny the credit of bravery to men who were doing their duty, under the direction of their superior officers. I have only one more remark to make in vindication of myself. I perceive that another excuse for these riots is found in some language which I am alleged to have used. I see in the report to which reference has been made, that the fierce and bad feelings which began the riots arose from some speech of mine in this House of a hostile and contemptuous character towards the Protestants of Ulster. Now, Sir, that is a pure fabrication. I have now for six years and a-half been writing and speaking, almost without cessation, upon Irish affairs, and I dare say—though I should like to examine a little before I admit it—that things may have been said and written by me which might better have been unsaid and unwritten. But I do affirm without fear of contradiction—that from the day on which I became Chief Secretary down to this hour, neither in the House of Commons, nor anywhere else, have I used a single expression, or allowed a sentiment to escape from me which, in the judgment of any right and fair-minded man, the Protestants of Ulster have the slightest reason to find fault with as offensive or disrespectful to them. How should I use language of that kind? Why should I say one single word that would mark religious difference in Ulster or anywhere else? The whole basis of our policy is, and has been, the hope and the belief that the only chance for Ireland—the only chance of putting an end to these deadly and hateful animosities — is that Irishmen of all creeds, of all ranks, and of all stations, should join in a strong union and a generous co-operation in the noble and beneficent task of raising their own land, and the people who live in it, from the distraction and desolation into which the government of Ireland by this Parliament has so unfortunately allowed her to fall.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.) said, he would bear in mind the advice of his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), to abstain from any words that might tend to add to the excitement in Belfast. It was to be regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary (Mr. John Morley) had not been more careful in that respect in his allusion to his (Colonel Waring's) hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Saunderson), for he had been scarcely so moderate as he might have been in attributing to his hon. and gallant Friend that the language he had used was the language of rebellion. The hon. and gallant Gentleman never did say, nor had he (Colonel Waring) himself ever said, that if the measure of the late Government passed the Protestants of the North of Ireland would be justified in resisting it by force of arms. ["Oh, oh!"] What he did say was that he would not consider himself bound by a Parliament sitting in Dublin; and that if, as the result of its passing, the Party to whom the Government of Ireland was to be handed over should adopt measures which the Protestants of the North considered interfered with the rights and liberties which their forefathers had won for them, the descendants of those forefathers would be justified in resisting them. That was what they had said, still said, and that was what they intended to abide by. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was curious that any rational persons should suppose that any Parliament would legislate in fear of threats held out by riotous mobs; but, if he (Colonel Waring) recollected rightly, a very strong argument of the right hon. Gentleman, in supporting the Bill lately laid before Parliament, was drawn from the consequences that might be expected from riotous proceedings that had their rise on the other side of the Atlantic. If that was not a proposal to yield to intimidation he was at a loss to know what it meant. As to the riots in Belfast, he was glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he did not believe the Orangemen had caused these riots——

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I passed no opinion at all upon that point, and I said that I was particularly anxious to pass no opinion upon it.

COLONEL WARING, continuing, said, he could not see how it could be said, as had frequently been said, that these riots were of constant recurrence in Belfast when there had been no disturbance in the town from 1872 until the present year. As to the accusation against the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary, that he purposely drafted Roman Catholic police into Belfast for the purpose of menacing the Protestants of that town, he (Colonel Waring) did not believe that there was any foundation for such an allegation; but unfortunate results did arise from the feeling displayed by the policemen who were sent there; and, unless he was much misinformed, circumstances would come out at the judicial inquiry which would probably induce the right hon. Gentleman to change the view he had expressed on that point. In referring to the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sexton), he (Colonel Waring) would, at the same time, be able to reply to the hon. Gentleman (Mr. P. McDonald) who opened the debate that evening. That hon. Gentleman had apparently been reading a little book entitled *What to do with Cold Mutton*, for his own speech was simply a rehash of that of the hon. Member for South Sligo or elsewhere. That hon. Gentleman had taken the unusual course of bringing the question forward in the form of an Amendment to the Address, on the ground that it was so urgent that it could not wait a moment; but the hon. Member, in the speech with which he introduced his Amendment, expressed the opinion that no further riots were to be feared in Belfast, because they were only excited by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the purpose of getting a Conservative Government into power. They had heard a great deal suggested, or rather demanded, in the Amendment about the suppression of the local magistrates in Belfast; but that was precisely what was done by the Resident Magistrate and his advisers. ["No, no!"] Every proceeding that took place in Belfast was at the instigation of the senior Resident Magistrate and his advisers, and Sir Edward Harland and the local magistrates were kept out in the cold until the advent to Office of the present Chief Secretary. The chain of responsibility passed from the Chief Secretary to police officers, and, not as in England, through the magistrate sworn to do justice between man and man; and although such a course of procedure might meet the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, he unhesitatingly denounced the course that had been taken as un-Constitutional. Passing now to the question of the provocation given for the riots at Belfast, the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Amendment had alluded to the often-repeated story of an attack upon a Roman Catholic religious house in the neighbourhood of Belfast, on the occasion of Lord Iddesleigh's visit two or three years ago. That statement had been repeatedly contradicted; but he found that when such allegations were made, time after time, in that House, they were likely to make some impression upon English credulity, and that it was necessary, therefore, to contradict them as often as they were made. It was well known, and had been proved over and over again, that the processionists on that occasion offered no violence to anybody or anything, but that a few "Corner Boys" following the procession did throw some stones, which broke a few small windows in the establishment mentioned; but, so far from what occurred having accelerated the death of the Lady Superior, who was lying on her death bed at the time, they had the evidence of the sister who was attending her, given the next day before the Resident Magistrate, to the effect that she did not even hear any noise on the occasion. Attention had been called to very lamentable affairs that took place in Armagh previous to the Rebellion of 1798; and an oath had been read which was supposed to be the oath of the Orange Society, that had been already repeatedly and emphatically denied. Attempts were continually being made to identify the Orange Institution in its earlier days with the illegal Association that went by the name of "Peep-o'-Day Boys," with which it had no connection whatever. That was, undoubtedly, an illegal Association; but, as it was got up against landlordism, he should have thought that it would have had the sympathy of those Irish Members who sat below the Gangway on the Opposition side. Orangemen had nothing whatever to do with the recent riots, and he did not think that the Representatives of Ulster had ever taken credit for the gallantry displayed by the Belfast mob. His friend, Dr. Kane, did his best to prevent the disturbances, and interfered almost at the risk of his life, by facing the muskets of the police, to put an end to them; and the very fact that he was not successful went to prove that Orangemen took no active part in them. As to the tunes played at Ulster demonstrations, and which had been objected to as provocative, he was not much of a musician; but he did know that some of the tunes they played most were those which were accepted and recognized as loyal and patriotic throughout all the rest of the Empire. It had been said that the Loyalists of Ulster ought not to have made demonstrations on days which they were accustomed to treat as anniversaries. Surely a time when they were told that they would soon be treated as aliens and strangers in their own country was not exactly that when they should be asked to forget that on former occasions they had been compelled to use force to protect themselves from violence. The objection of the Loyalists to the meetings held by the other Party was easily understood. These meetings were generally held in localities which the members of Protestant congregations had to traverse on their way to and from their places of worship. The Protestants were compelled to shoulder their way through jeering crowds, and very naturally objected to what they considered a desecration of the Sabbath. With reference to the question of the police, he wished to endorse what had been said of their conduct in the past by the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary. No doubt it was an admirable Force, and had done its duty on many occasions with courage and vigour; but he feared that for some time past it had been living in a malarious atmosphere; that they had been affected lately by their exposure to the bad climate of the South; and anyone who had been similarly exposed must have experienced the same result. He feared that for the last six years the Force had not been improving, and that the proposals in the House of Commons lately had not been without their effect on it. It could not be said to be wonderful, when hearing that their stewardship might soon be taken from them, that they should try to make friends with the Mammon of unrighteousness. It was now, however, placed under more favourable conditions, and he hoped that it would again do its duty without fear, favour, or affection. He thought, however, that those who were not so well informed as the Members of the House might well look with suspicion on the recent conduct of the police of Belfast; but he would not say one word to increase the agitation and suspicion in the minds of the people while the inquiry was proceeding. He felt sure that the decision of the Commission which was going to sit in Belfast would be accepted by all parties in the North of Ireland with respect, for they had been assured by the Government that it would do its work well. No special or local knowledge was required in a person to hold the inquiry into the Belfast riots. At present it was composed of four Members, which was an undesirable number, as they might be equally divided in their Report. It would be a great advantage if an Englishman was added. He would, therefore, suggest that it would be better that the Commission should consist of five rather than four Members; and he must express his gratification that the inquiry was to be a searching one, and that the guilty would be punished, for it was well that it should be known that when crime was brought home to any man, neither the colour of his coat nor the position he held would protect him from the consequences.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) said, the hon. and gallant Gentleman's (Colonel Waring's) explanation of the treasonable boast that had been made was very novel; for in Ulster the statement made over and over again by Orangemen was, that if the Home Rule Bill were to be passed they would rise up and resist it by force of arms. He felt bound to refer to the conduct of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) in accusing the police in Belfast of having been drunk while on duty, for he thought it was a slander which was effectually refuted when it was made. The hon. Gentleman had been brought by the Resident Magistrate to the barracks where the men were, and forced to admit that he had made a charge utterly and entirely without foundation. Moreover, one would have imagined that, if true, such a grave charge would have been made on the floor of the House of Commons. The hon. Member had, however, taken care not to do that. He (Mr. Clancy) held, with the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), that the Orange Body had nothing whatever to do with the riots, and he certainly believed that a great many Orangemen regretted them; but he could not agree that the residuum of which they had heard consisted entirely of "Corner Boys" and roughs. He could not admit that the brave fellows who made war on the police and soldiers, and fired on them, were entirely the "Corner Boys" of Belfast. As a proof of that, he would refer hon. Members to the case of Mr. Scott, an ex-Water Commissioner, and to the case of the son of the editor of the leading Orange newspaper, who got six months' imprisonment. That they consisted mainly of "Corner Boys" might be true; but they had their officers in well-clad blackguards, who were respectably connected; and he believed that those latter, and not the persons whom they led, were mainly responsible for the dirty work that was done, and for the havoc that had been produced. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had attempted to defend the Orangemen, who were, he said, attacked when they were marching with a band of music; and he added, that it was not a crime or illegal to play music in the streets. It certainly was not illegal to play music in the streets of Belfast, as it was not illegal to play it anywhere else; but, at the same time, neither was it illegal to light a match in a powder magazine, but it was dangerous; and experience had shown that it was dangerous to play Party tunes in the streets at a time of public excitement. He (Mr. Clancy) said that band playing sometimes led to crime and violence; and whether it was in the Nationalist South, or in the Protestant North, he had no hesitation in saying that it ought to be stopped on both sides. Now, the question in this matter was, what was the Government going to do? He had found no satisfactory answer to this important question in the speech delivered by the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). The right hon. Gentleman deprecated lengthened debate on the question, because, he said, it would make the task of restoring order in Ireland more difficult than it was now. That, doubtless, was all very right and proper under ordinary circumstances; but, in the present case, what would really have the effect of making order more difficult to restore in Ireland would be reticence on the part of the Members of the Government, from which it could be deduced that there were certain persons in Belfast privileged to shoot down and trample upon their fellow-citizens; and that because such persons were well-dressed and respectably connected, and, perhaps, had occupied high positions in the State, they ought to be permitted to utter inflammable language likely to lead to riot and disorder. Plain speaking was wanted on this subject. They had not got it yet; and if they did not get it before the debate closed, he had no hesitation in saying that the responsibility of any further rioting which might take place would rest on the heads of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland said—"Wait for the result of the Commission of Inquiry;" but the Commission had not yet began to take evidence. When it had begun, it would not soon end its labours, and it would take a considerable time to consider its Report; and beyond that, even when it had sent in this Report to the Government, a good deal of time would be taken in considering what should be done with it. All this time the houses and lives and property of the people of Belfast would be in daily peril and danger from the outrages of the "Corner Boys," represented in that House by the hon. and gallant Member on the Ministerial Benches. The Irish Members also might have to propose legislation on the subject, and they knew that this legislation might be opposed by some hon. Members. To defend the Catholics of Belfast, the Government ought to take certain steps immediately, and he contended that one of the first of these should be to deprive the Mayor of Belfast and the other borough magistrates of their magisterial functions. Half the blackguardism and all the courage of those "Corner Boys" arose from the confidence they had in the leniency and partizanship of the Mayor and these magistrates, and until these magistrates were removed these disturbances would not cease. He had spoken some words about the Mayor of Belfast on the first night of the Session, for which he was taken to task; but, from all he knew on the subject, he felt bound to say that the Mayor of Belfast was not a person at any time to be retained in the Commission of the Peace, and most certainly not at such times as the present. He wished to ask the Government several questions with regard to Sir Edward Harland and the local magistrates. He regretted that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Attorney General for Ireland had left the House; but, doubtless, some other Member of the Government would inform them of the questions. Was it or was it not true that the Inspector General (Mr. Read) asked the Mayor of Belfast to join in a Memorial to the Lord Lieutenant for a general warrant to search for arms in the Shankhill Road; and was it true, or was it not true, that the Mayor absolutely refused to join in any such Memorial? He wanted to know, also, whether it was true or not that although the Inspector General (Mr. Read) declared that the marching to and fro, to their work, of hundreds of the Mayor's *employés* in a body was itself illegal, and advised its discontinuance, that the Mayor absolutely refused to exercise his influence towards stopping these marches? Lastly, he wanted to know whether it was true or not that this Mayor of Belfast had been habitually cheered by the Orange mobs when he appeared amongst them; and that he had not only not resented demonstrations of that kind, as any man in his official position ought to have done, but had actually welcomed it, and shaken hands with the leaders, and hundreds of the rioters? He (Mr. Clancy) maintained that that had been the case, and that the Government was bound to ask the Mayor of Belfast whether that was the case or not. If it was so, he maintained that to keep the Mayor in office any longer was to put a premium on crime, disorder, and outrage in the town. There were other serious questions to which the Government should lend some attention. For example, he wished to know whether it was true or not that when the police had arrested a rioter on the Shankhill Road a borough magistrate named Little came on the scene and insisted on the prisoner being released, with the result that when the constable returned to his duty he was seized and beaten so savagely by the mob that he was still unfit for duty? He also wanted to know whether a magistrate named Ewart, a son of the hon. Member for Belfast, and another magistrate, did not get the police withdrawn from a certain district of Belfast, with the result that the public-house of a widow named O'Haire was immediately sacked? These were the questions to which the Irish Members had a right to demand immediate answers. This question of the magistracy was, to his mind, the chief question to be considered; for the Orange rioters in Belfast had hitherto proceeded in their bloody and murderous work with the knowledge that even if they were caught red-handed in the work they would have the sympathy of the borough Bench. He would like to ask whether the Government intended to make the Proclamation issued by the late Lord Lieutenant a reality, or to keep it a sham? He believed that, up to the present time, only one house in Belfast had been searched for arms, and that the house of a Catholic. After the events of the past month he thought the Government could not but see that it was time to abandon their policy of shilly-shallying and sham, and to show that they really meant it when they said they would establish social order in Belfast.

SIR JAMES CORRY (Armagh, Mid) said, he had no intention of trespassing very long upon the attention of the House; but the attack which had been made upon the Mayor of Belfast was of such a nature as to call for a defence at his hands. He knew the Mayor of Belfast, perhaps, a great deal better than anyone in the House, and he could say with truth that a more honourable, or straightforward, or upright man did not exist; and that if hon. Gentlemen who sat below the Gangway opposite had done as much for Ireland as Sir Edward Harland had done the country would be in a very different position to that in which it was at the present day. He was perfectly satisfied that when the investigation was held—and he was glad it was now to be held very shortly—it would be found that the Mayor of Belfast had, in regard to the disturbances, most certainly done his duty faithfully to every section of the inhabitants of the town. He was well aware that prejudice had been excited against Sir Edward Harland, and the firm with which he was connected, because a large number of their workmen were of the Protestant religion; but he wished most emphatically to say that the members of the firm did not inquire into the religious persuasion of any men who entered their employment. [An hon. MEMBER: But their foremen do.] If the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), who introduced this Amendment yesterday, had lived in Belfast as long as he (Sir James Corry) had done, and had mixed as much with the workmen in the town, he would have been very slow, indeed, to have brought forward such an Amendment at the present time, because he would have known that the people were of a most excitable nature; that their passions were easily inflamed; and that, under circumstances like the present, it was most difficult to preserve order. Yesterday he interrupted the hon. Gentleman when he said the employers of Belfast, especially of the firm of Harland and Wolff, had discharged all the Roman Catholic workmen since these occurrences took place.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) begged leave to say that the hon. Baronet had completely mistaken what the hon. Member for West Belfast had said. What the hon. Gentleman did say was that the Roman Catholic workmen had to leave.

SIR JAMES CORRY: He said they had been dismissed.

MR. H. CAMPBELL (Fermanagh, S.): He said they had to leave.

SIR JAMES CORRY: That they were dismissed from the place. ["No, no!"] Well, the hon. Gentleman would not deny the statement made, that the Corporation of Belfast dismissed all the Roman Catholics that they had in their employment. He (Sir James Corry) had a telegram from the Town Clerk of Belfast, which he desired to read to the House, because it entirely refuted the statement of the hon. Gentleman. The telegram was to this effect—

"Report of Mr. Sexton's speech last night states that 28 scavengers and carters were dis

> missed by this Corporation. I am directed to inform you that there is not a word of truth in the statement. Not one Roman Catholic *employé* was dismissed."

And he knew, as a matter of fact, that a considerable number of Roman Catholics were employed by Messrs. Harland and Wolff, and that not one Roman Catholic left work at the Island during the riots. In proof of this he would refer hon. Members opposite to Mr. James Ross, one of the Belfast borough magistrates, who went over to the works on the Island for the sole purpose of inquiring into the allegation, and the books of the firm were produced to him, and Mr. Ross was perfectly satisfied that the members of the firm had done nothing to cause any Roman Catholic in their employ to leave their work. He (Sir James Corry) believed that a few days ago it was stated in *The Belfast Morning News* that some Roman Catholic had been annoyed at the Island and was obliged to leave his work. Indeed, it was this statement which prompted Mr. Ross to visit the Island. What was stated in *The Belfast Morning News* really occurred in 1884. The matter was brought under the notice of the members of the firm, who made an investigation, with the result that the men who had committed the outrage upon their fellow-workmen were dismissed, and they were out of work for six months, and before they were allowed to return to work on the Island they were required to pay a fine of £5 each. Such was the way in which the Island works were conducted by the firm which had been so much maligned. So far as he (Sir James Corry) was personally concerned, he never in any intercourse with his workmen asked them what their religion was; and it was only a matter of accident if he knew whether a workman of his was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. He was perfectly satisfied that the employers generally in Belfast acted on the very same principle that he did. He did not wish to go into the general question of the cause of the riots, because he thought that, now that the matter was to be investigated, it would soon be known who was right and who was wrong; how the riots commenced, who was responsible for their continuance, and whether the police were to blame in what they had done. But he desired to say that when the late Government announced that they were about to issue this Commission, he took the first opportunity that presented itself to him to speak to the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary. He told that right hon. Gentleman that he was very pleased that the Commission was going to be issued; but he expressed the belief that unless the Commission could take evidence on oath the result would not be satisfactory to any Parliament. He was glad that the present Government had adopted his views, and that the Bill which was now before the House to enable the Commissioners to take evidence on oath would be prosecuted, although it had been blocked by hon. Gentlemen opposite, for what reason he was at a loss to understand. No one deplored these riots and outrages more than he did. He took a very active part in 1872 in endeavouring to suppress the riots then occurring, and he knew that his brother magistrates were equally active; and he thought that when the Commission came to inquire into the matter, if the borough magistrates had adopted the same precautions and displayed the same activity in the recent riots—and he was sure they had done so—as had been shown by their predecessors in 1872, no fault would be found with the action of the magistrates on this occasion. He was also perfectly satisfied that the fault would be found not to be all on one side. With regard to the statement that the only houses broken into were those of Catholics, he would say that he was satisfied mistakes had been committed on both sides; but he did not mean to go into that question now. His only hope was that the investigation would have the effect of putting matters right. Anyhow, it was a serious matter for the people of Belfast to have to pay the cost of the extra police force and the cost of the great damage which had been done to property, not to mention the injury done to business and the trade of the town. He had no sympathy with disorder, and therefore sincerely hoped that they had seen the end of these riots; and he was glad to think that the administration of the law would be carried out firmly by the present Government as well in Belfast as in other parts of Ireland. It was his wish to see the law enforced with equal-handed justice all over Ireland.

MR. H. CAMPBELL (Fermanagh, S.) said, with reference to the fact that several Catholic workmen had been dismissed from the works of the Mayor of Belfast, that, in addition to one man who was brutally assaulted and compelled to leave his work, five men, whose names he could give, had been compelled to quit their employment. It was, therefore, a matter beyond dispute that these people had been disemployed. It was strange, indeed, to hear from an Opposition Bench praise of the "Corner Boys," who, when they were routed by the Constabulary, took shelter in their houses and fired through portholes. He declared that the Orangemen were mainly responsible for the state of things which had led up to the riots, for prominent men in that body had been inciting the lower order of their followers to deeds of violence for two or three years past. The Proclamation against the possession of firearms, too, had not been obeyed, because the magistrates were Orangemen. Unless the magistracy were reconstituted, they could only anticipate a repetition of the riots. No Catholic could live, or dare live, in the Shankhill Road district, where the rioting was hottest. Beyond that, it had not been contradicted that the bolts and pieces of iron used as missiles were abstracted by the Orange workmen from the workshops of the Chief Magistrate. As long as magistrates were permitted to make fiery speeches inciting to violence the riots would continue. It was, in fact, difficult to believe there was any real desire on the part of the Government to get at the truth by their inquiry. He did not blame the rank and file of the Party; but he blamed the landlords for inciting the Orangemen of the North of Ireland to do deeds of violence. He had known some good Orangemen, but they were of the educated class. The lower class Orangemen were always ready to endorse the incitements of the landlords of the North, and to start forth to slay and murder..

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) said, that, as a Member from the North of Ireland, he thought it necessary to raise his voice to protest against statements that had been made with reference to his Catholic fellow-countrymen in the North of Ireland. An effort had been made by some speakers to give the question a sectarian view. Hon. Members on that side of the House had scrupulously avoided doing that. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), in his precise and exact statement with reference to the origin of the riots, made every effort to avoid confounding the Orangemen of Belfast with those who originated the riots. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) had not followed that example; for he attributed the feeling in Belfast to the want of loyalty in the South, and he said that the policemen in Belfast committed outrages, because they had the freedom of the public-houses. As a Scotchman, the hon. Member was not a fit judge of the aspirations of the Irish people; and it was very remarkable that he, a stranger, should dictate to Irishmen what was necessary for the good of their country. As an Ulsterman, he (Mr. Pinkerton) was ready to bear witness to the good feeling which prevailed, and to the religious tolerance exercised by the Catholics in other parts of Ireland towards their Protestant fellow-countrymen. They had heard a great deal about religious tolerance in Ireland; but it was a well-known fact that in the South and West the strongest passport to the affections of the people was for a man to be a Protestant, and in sympathy with the national aspirations of the people. He witnessed, a short time ago, the demonstration in Dublin in honour of Lord Aberdeen, Her Majesty's Representative; and the next day he saw loyalty, in its most revolting form, in the streets of Belfast. He considered the report of Mr. Patton, published in *The Times*, perfectly preposterous, and he could not credit the statement that policemen openly boasted of the number of people they had shot. He had seen Protestant policemen firmly suppress disturbances on the 12th of July, and Roman Catholic policemen observe rigid impartiality when the Roman Catholics disturbed the public peace. It would require a person to have lived some time in the North of Ireland to enable them to appreciate the forbearance, the long suffering, and the patient endurance of the Catholics there when the Orange anniversaries came round each year. Every village was covered with flaunting offensive emblems, which were such an outrage upon good feeling and good taste that they would turn Oscar Wilde green with disgust. In fact, he was himself disgusted at the outrages on good feeling and on good faith which were constantly to be witnessed in the North of Ireland, and he admired the patient endurance with which the Catholics of the North of Ireland submitted to having Orange flags flaunted in their faces. He had heard the "Corner Boys" of Belfast, whom he supposed a kindred feeling had induced the hon. Member for South Tyrone to admire so much, use the vilest and most insulting language to Catholic priests. He challenged any hon. Member to point out where any such conduct had been indulged in by boys in the West or South of Ireland to Protestant ministers. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) stated that he objected to being ruled by hon. Members from Ireland who sat below the Gangway, and had described them as gaol birds. But if the hon. and gallant Gentleman carried out the intention he had stated that evening, it was quite certain that he would soon realize what a plank bed was like. Anyhow, it could not be said to be a very enviable position for the hon. and gallant Gentleman to occupy to be the licensed buffoon of the Party to which he belonged. When he ceased to be a landlord, and had disappeared from the House, there was one place still open to him, and that was the ring of a circus. He would admit that Protestant employers did not discharge their Catholic workmen for their religion; but they did nothing to prevent them being insulted by their Protestant fellow-workmen. He looked forward, however, with the hon. Member for one of the divisions of Dublin, to the time when those sectarian differences would cease; and when the Orangemen were freed from the baneful influences under which they lived at present he hoped to see the National banner of green intermingled with the Orange waving over a united Ireland.

Mr. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) said, he denied the right of the hon. Gentleman who had last addressed the House to speak for the Protestants of Ireland. The Protestants of Ireland did not wish to be represented in that House by the hon. Member, or any other renegades to their religion. [" Oh, oh ! " " Order ! " *and loud cries of* " Withdraw ! "]

Dr. COMMINS (Roscommon, E.): I rise to Order, Sir. I wish to know whether the hon. and learned Gentleman is in Order in speaking of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Pinkerton), or any other Member of the House, as a renegade to his religion or anything else?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Gentleman must withdraw that expression. It is un-Parliamentary.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, he bowed to the ruling of the Chair, and would withdraw the expression as being un-Parliamentary. He desired to say, however, that the hon. Gentleman opposite, who belonged nominally to the Protestant Party, did not in any way represent those attributes which Irish Protestants held to be closely associated with that particular profession of faith. The hon. Member boasted that he had experienced the generosity of Catholic constituencies in other parts of Ireland. He did not deny that the hon. Member had been elected by a Catholic constituency; but he had failed to secure the support of Protestant constituencies in the North of Ireland, having justly forfeited any claim he might have had to their support. Irish Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House had been challenged by hon. Gentlemen opposite to deny the subsidizing of Orange Lodges by Irish Protestant Members. As representing a constituency which contained more Orange Lodges than any other in Ireland, he was sure that was not so. He would answer for himself that, previous to the last two Elections, he had not given a single subscription to an Orange Lodge. He thought the debate had lengthened itself out without benefit to the subject-matter, or giving the House any information as to the origin of the riots. In fact, the time of the House had been wasted merely to reproduce in a considerably watered form the speeches of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) and East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), and that delivered by the hon. Member for North Fermanagh (Mr. H. Campbell) was certainly as dull as ditch water. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) had been attacked for defending the bravery of the "Corner Boys" of Belfast. He simply contrasted their bravery with that of the "Moonlighters." That hon. Member had made a personal investigation, and was prepared to stand by the statements that he made; and it was for the benefit of the House that he took part in the debate. His hon. Friend was further accused of having crawled into the House over the heads of Orangemen. On the other hand, he had crawled in over the body of a late Member of the House, and both Parties in the county approved of him. The fact of the hon. Member for West Belfast setting up as the champion of law and order put him in mind of Satan rebuking sin. Dr. Hanna had come under the rebuke of the hon. Gentleman opposite; but the fact was that he had, in company with another Presbyterian clergyman, and at the risk of his life, done what he could to restore law and order. These rev. gentlemen declared that they did not recognize among the rioters any of their congregation; nor, indeed, anyone who was known to them as a Presbyterian. The working men had held meetings in Belfast in support of the Mayor's Proclamation. The riots at Belfast had been greatly deprecated by the Protestant working classes in the town, and especially by the ships' carpenters, who would compare favourably with any class of workmen in any part of the United Kingdom. He did not now, nor at any other time, join in accusing the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. John Morley), whose speech had been straightforward enough, of having had an invidious motive in selecting the police force sent to Belfast from other districts of Ireland. Unfortunately, the right hon. Gentleman was not popular in the North of Ireland, and especially in Belfast, where he was regarded with strong dislike, in consequence of his Irish policy and of his tone. The right hon. Gentleman's whole conduct and policy during the discussion of this question, and his manner in the House during the late Parliament to the Representatives of the Union Party from Ulster, were calculated to arouse strong feelings of suspicion and very acute jealousy with regard to any action that he might have taken in Belfast. Unfortunately, the right hon. Gentleman had differed from the local magistrates in Belfast as to the course which ought to have been taken to put a stop to the riots; and, unfortunately for that town and for the right hon. Gentleman himself, the result, where he had so differed from the Local Authority, had not been conducive to the maintenance of law and order, or to the preservation of the peace. There had also, most unfortunately, been a conflict of opinion between the Local Authority and the Stipendiary Magistrates who were sent to Belfast. ["Hear, hear!"] He was glad to receive that cheer from hon. Gentlemen opposite, led by the hon. Member (Mr. Biggar), whose lead in these matters was generally taken. He had strongly protested against what the right hon. Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne had stated, when he said that he was misrepresented through the malignant credulity of the Belfast community. He certainly thought the late Government were taking a great responsibility upon themselves when they deprived the Local Authority of the means of restoring law and order. That was not the place, nor the time, to discuss the action of the Constabulary, which would be reported upon by the Commission; but he was prepared to assert that not only previous to, but since, the late Chief Secretary held Office, that force had been considerably weakened in its moral tone in consequence of the policy which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had proposed should be carried into effect. In conclusion, he desired to express his firm conviction that it would be most disastrous for Ireland if every magistrate who was an Orangeman were to be removed from the Commission of the Peace.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Wexford, N.): My Ulster constituency—equally divided almost between Catholics and Protestants—are highly interested in this question of the Belfast riots. There is one real cause for the riots which have taken place in Belfast. The last speaker—the hon. Member for Antrim (Mr. Macartney)—has referred to Protestant Home Rulers as renegades from their religion. I shall not condescend to follow the hon. Tory Member for Antrim through the low and scurrilous depths of language into which he has fallen.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has made use of an improper and un-Parliamentary expression, and I hope he will at once withdraw it.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Sir, I will withdraw it most unreservedly.

Mr. SPEAKER: It appears to me that the expression almost demands an apology to the House, and I caution the hon. Member against repeating such language.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I have already withdrawn it; but I assure you, Sir, that there was nothing further from my intention than to transgress your ruling, or to say anything which would place me under the censure of the House. I will not again use the words which I have withdrawn with reference to the hon. Member opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not dealing at all with the Amendment before the House. He has not spoken at all relevant to the subject, and I warn him to be more relevant.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will do as you wish with the greatest readiness; and again I assure you, Sir, that I have no real intention of doing so. [*Laughter.*] As soon as I am allowed to proceed free from the interruptions of hon. Members who laugh so heartily I will resume my remarks. I will now proceed with the arguments that I wish to lay before the House. I merely wish to point out that language which accused a co-religionist, without adequate reason shown, of being a renegade to his religion was wanton and improper. I am sure a respectable Protestant or Catholic would not do such a thing. But the hon. utterer of the criticism must be excused, because he is not regarded in any light of importance as a weighty Representative of anything in Ireland or anywhere else. The hon. Member (Mr. Macartney), in his rambling speech, wandered all over the political arena, and it occurred to him to make a defence of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell); but he did so in a manner that could not have been gratifying to that hon. Gentleman. I am not in political accord with the hon. Member for South Tyrone, for the hon. Member holds no views, politically or religiously, I believe, in unison with myself. I will not even say that the hon. Member's (Mr. Macartney's) speech was "ditch water," although he said that about the speech of one of my hon. Friends. In fact, I will not follow such an ungentlemanly line of argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member repeats this language I shall have to take the very severe course of naming him. This is the second time I have called him to Order for using expressions which are highly improper and un-Parliamentary. I will now ask him to express regret to the House for having used the last expression which has fallen from him.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: The expression "ungentlemanly" I unreservedly withdraw, and I would not have used it if I had thought it was un-Parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not consider that the hon. Member has made an apology to the House?

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then, Sir, I will apologize to the House. I had no intention to infringe the Rules at all. The cause of the riots, in my opinion, was not the differences of religion, but the fact that the Orange Society was allowed to insult the Catholic people. There is no parallel between the Orange Society and the National League. The bands of the National League never played a single bar of music which could wound the religious susceptibilities of the Protestants of Ireland. The riots in Ulster were caused by the Orange processions and bands. Tunes were played and songs were sung which were insulting to the religious belief of the Catholic people. One of the tunes was entitled "We'll kick the Pope before us," and the following was one of the verses of a song which was frequently sung outside Catholic churches and in the presence of Catholic priests and laymen:—

> "Slither, slather,
> "Holy Water,
> "Sprinkle the Papishes every one.
> "We will cut them asunder,
> "And make them lie under;
> "The Protestant Boys shall carry the drum."

It was provocation such as this that had led the Catholic people in Ulster many times to retaliate. I believe, however, that the great bulk of the Protestants in Ulster do not approve these insulting displays. Indeed, I am certain that the respectable Protestants take no part in this persecuting and insulting conduct. The resentment of a portion of the Catholics is against the Orange Society, which is not political in its object, but which spends its time, and uses its money, and plays its tunes in order to insult the Catholics of Ulster. The

Royal Commission may get to the bottom of these particular riots; but it will do no good in regard to the permanent pacification of the Province. A stop cannot be put to the disturbances until the Government take some action which will render it illegal for any society to act in a directly offensive and insulting way against people who do not agree with them in religion. Again, I think that the system of unpaid magistrates in Ireland ought to be abolished. The people believe, at present, that the magistrates sympathize with the Orangemen; the administration of the law is in the hands of men who are looked upon as partizans, and, as a consequence, it is regarded lightly. If an impartial official like General Buller had been sent to Belfast, better justice would have been meted out, in the opinion of the people, than by the local officials.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's Co., Ossory) said, the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) had described the Orange rioters as "Corner Boys;" but that description did not apply to the Islandmen, who appeared to have taken a very active part in the riots. The hon. Member assumed an impartial air; but he had shown that he had no sympathy with national sentiment, and he was afraid the language he had used would considerably injure his influence in Ireland. He spoke of the tolerance of Catholics in Ireland, and said they never heard of a disturbance like that in Belfast, on religious grounds, taking place in Cork. That was to be accounted for—and he spoke as a Protestant—by the fact that the Catholics of Ireland had learned the lesson of toleration. He quoted several instances of this toleration which had come under his notice, and some acts of which he had experience. It was said in the opening of this debate—and he wished to enforce the statement—that there had not been a single house in the Catholic quarter of Belfast belonging to a Protestant injured, and not a single Protestant had been compelled to leave that quarter. Now, that spoke volumes to those who had minds open to understanding. The hon. Member then described the character of the Orangemen, and pointed to the dangerous effect of the so-called religious teaching which Orangemen heard Sunday after Sunday from their religious instructors. He blamed the borough magistrates of Belfast for their conduct in connection with the riots. They took the batons from the police at one time, and deprived them of their arms at another. And if that was the notion the borough magistrates had of maintaining the peace when the town was in a state of rebellion and disturbance, all he could say was that they seemed to have a very strange idea of their duty. With reference to the speech delivered by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Belfast, he thought the main point was to consider the effect upon the minds of the people whom he was addressing, and he was bound to consider what the result would be of stimulating their passions. The noble Lord was not ignorant of Ireland, and had not the excuse of bigotry; for he remembered that when the Duke of Marlborough was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the noble Lord denounced, in very strong language, the Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics. What was to be done? They had heard of a Royal Commission to investigate this matter. Well, he thought he knew what this Royal Commission would do. There would be a great many witnesses examined, and when in England all was forgotten about the subject there would be a very elaborate Report, and it would be gravely mentioned that the Commissioners had examined a great deal into the evidence brought before them, and had come to the conclusion that it was quite impossible to say whether Protestants or Catholics were most to blame; and if the Commissioners suggested anything, it would be something that the Government would never carry out. He supported the suggestion that the borough magistrates should be superseded in their power by magistrates directly responsible to the Executive. The suggestion was supported by what had happened in Dublin, where a disturbance was put down in a few hours. In Dublin, however, the magistrates were directly responsible to the Executive, and the police were directly under the authority of Her Majesty's Government; and if the same thing existed in Belfast they would not hear of such disturbances. It was suggested by the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) that the police force should be increased. That was very reasonable in a town which, at any moment, was liable to burst forth into a conflagration. But these were only means of dealing with outward symptoms of that religious bigotry which at present existed in Belfast. One remedy he suggested, as a way to stop these riots and to convert the bigots into good citizens, was to make the country a real self-governing one. The decline of public spirit on the part of the Protestants of Ireland was due to the removal of the centre of political life in that country. Give a centre of political life to Ireland, and men would have something better to do than to squabble about their miserable differences which had kept them so long asunder, and they would take a pride in their country. When he came to this country nothing impressed him so much as this — that, apart from all difference of creed and opinion, there was one thing all agreed in, and that was in the proud consciousness of being Englishmen. Give to Ireland a Government to be proud of; give her a Constitution she would care to maintain; give her something to bind her sons closer together in warm affection, and the result would be that Protestants and Catholics would unite — as they had never united hitherto—to promote the honour and dignity of the nation.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I only propose to occupy the time of the House for a few moments, and I should not have risen to take part in the discussion at all if it were not for the fact that I am a native of Belfast, and have probably had a longer residence in the county in which it is situated than any hon. Member, with the exception of the hon. Member for North Belfast (Mr. Ewart). Therefore, in what I am about to say I speak from a long experience, gathered from more than 50 years' acquaintance with the locality; and I am prepared to say, without hesitation, that the real cause of the riots which take place periodically in Belfast is that justice is not honestly administered in that town, and never in my memory has it been. Perhaps I may be allowed to give a few illustrations of the way in which justice is administered by the persons who at present have the management of affairs in Belfast in their hands. Take, first, the Mayor of Belfast—Sir Edward Harland. That gentleman is one of the most extensive jobbers in the town of Belfast. He is Chairman of the Harbour Board, and in that capacity he has made an exceedingly large contract with the Corporation over which he himself presides. Not only that, but he has promoted the passage of a Bill through this House which will involve the Corporation in an expenditure of something like £200,000, and which expenditure will be entirely unproductive as far as the ratepayers of Belfast are concerned. In his capacity of Mayor of Belfast Sir Edward Harland has acted as a gross partizan in connection with these riots. In an early stage of the riots he went into the Protestant district, and after parleying with the rioters entered into confidential relations with them, and upon their representations withdrew the police and threw every obstacle in his power in the way of the proper administration of justice. What was the result? Of course, the rioters wrecked the houses of the Catholics who were unfortunate enough to live in that particular neighbourhood. And what has been the case with regard to the borough magistrates generally? It is notorious that the punishment they have inflicted upon the rioters has been of the most trivial nature. One of the punishments which were enforced years ago in the case of riots was that any person convicted of the offence of using Party language in the public streets should be fined 40*s.* and costs. Has that penalty been imposed in the present instance? The week after the riots began the borough magistrates let off persons who had been caught rioting, and even committing assaults, with no further punishment than a fine of 10*s.*, although everybody knows that for the offence of assault a much more severe punishment should be inflicted than for the utterance of mere Party cries. My hon. Friend the Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) referred to the case of Mr. Brown, a magistrate who interfered with a policeman who with great difficulty had apprehended a prisoner in the act of rioting. Mr. Brown insisted that the prisoner should be set free. The policeman let him go, and was subsequently brutally beaten by the mob of rioters into whose hands Mr. Brown was playing. Another magistrate, named Horner, and a son of the hon. Member for North Belfast (Mr. Ewart), withdrew the police from a particular locality in which rioting was going on, with the result that one man's life was lost, a Roman Catholic publican's house was wrecked, and a considerable amount of property was destroyed. Another borough magistrate—a Mr. Bell—ordered the police away from another district, with the result that the house of Mr. McChusky, a Roman Catholic publican, was destroyed. On another occasion, when the police had fired upon a mob who were attacking them, Mr. Lover, a borough magistrate, asked them who ordered the firing? The sergeant in charge said he gave the order; whereupon the magistrate said—"If I had been here when you gave the order I would have put a revolver to your head and would have blown your brains out." That is the sort of assistance the police get from the local magistrates, and it will show the House how the law is administered in Belfast. I may add, with regard to Sir Edward Harland, that it was from his works the iron bolts and nuts were obtained with which the Constabulary were assaulted by the rioters. It is notorious that for weeks after the riots commenced Sir Edward Harland took no steps to interfere with the appropriation of these bolts, although on ordinary occasions there are stringent rules enforced to prevent pilfering. In this instance, however, the men appeared to have been encouraged to commit these offences, and to make use of the property of the Mayor for the purpose of attacking the police. There is only one other instance I will refer to in my desire to show how justice is administered in Belfast, and it is the case of the borough Coroner. This gentleman has proved himself, on more than one occasion, to be a gross partizan so far as the performance of his duty is concerned, and during the recent riots he seems to have gone altogether out of his way, and to have taken the most unprecedented course—namely, that of issuing a warrant for the imprisonment of the policemen who were charged with rioting. It is well known that it is the duty of a Coroner to inquire into the cause of death only, and when prisoners have been arrested the custom is to bring them before the magistrates, who adjudicate upon the case, and not the borough Coroner. This gentleman, however, who is a stupid, prejudiced old man, sent the policemen to prison, and Her Majesty's Government, I am sorry to say, have acted in a different manner from other Governments in Ireland; because instead of attempting to protect the police, as has invariably been the case when public officers have been supposed to commit crimes in the performance of their duty, they have not taken the slightest steps for obtaining the release of the police from the position in which they have been placed. One word more as to the administration of the law with regard to the possession of arms in proclaimed districts. I am very much disposed myself to blame the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for permitting the Proclamation to be a dead letter. As is very well known, the late Government issued a Proclamation against the possession of arms in proclaimed districts; but although Belfast is a proclaimed district no steps were taken to have the law enforced. Up to the present moment Her Majesty's Government have not attempted, in the slightest degree, to enforce the Proclamation. I maintain that both the late and the present Government were to blame for that miscarriage of justice; and if Her Majesty's Advisers want to prove the sincerity of the anxiety they have professed to put down rioting, one of the first things they ought to do is to enforce the Proclamation, and to prevent the use of firearms.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Sir, I do not propose to enter into the dispute upon the details of the unfortunate occurrences in Belfast. I think that the demand of the Government that that should be left for the inquiry which has been instituted is a fair and reasonable demand, and I should not think of trenching upon it at all. But, Sir, there is a very important question with reference to what has occurred in Belfast, and what may occur elsewhere; and that is to inquire what is the attitude and what are the principles upon which the Executive Government of the Crown regard these matters and are prepared to act with respect to them. With reference to the language employed by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, I will say again, as I have said before, that that language seems to me to be fair, and conciliatory, and just. But then, Sir, I am sorry to say that the Chief Secretary for Ireland is not the sole, nor has he been even the principal, exponent of the policy of the Government with respect to Ireland. It was inevitable that the language which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer employed at Belfast and subsequently should come into this discussion. In my opinion, it lies at the root of a great deal that is in the past, and of still more that is in the future. Well, Sir, we have heard the doctrine of an hon. and gallant Gentleman, who seems, in this House, to act the part of Deputy Chief Secretary for Ireland—the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). He represents, and well represents, the old Party of Orange ascendancy, which has always been the favourite instrument of Tory Governments in Ireland. When my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) said that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had said no more than the Chancellor of the Exchequer I observed that the noble Lord intimated his acquiescence in that proposition. Now, Sir, what did the noble Lord go to Belfast for, and what did he do? I want to speak on this matter with as little of heat as possible. [An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] I do not know whether the hon. Member desires that I should speak with heat; but if he does I cannot oblige him in that respect. The noble Lord went to Belfast and announced himself—as he was quite entitled to announce himself—as the descendant of the great Duke of Marlborough, and as a blood relation of Castlereagh. [*Cries of* "Question!"] I do not know anything more to the question than the identification of the policy of the Government with that of Lord Castlereagh. I wish, however, that the language of the noble Lord had been a little more identical with that of Lord Castlereagh—I mean the great Lord Castlereagh. In spite of all the defects of his policy Lord Castlereagh was a man totally incapable of going to Belfast to stir up religious animosity and feuds of race. Lord Castlereagh was a man who, in order to carry the Union, gave pledges to the Catholics, for he knew the necessity of conciliating the Catholics of Ireland—pledges which were most disgracefully and flagitiously broken, and which, if they had been kept, the Union might possibly have had different results from those which ensued. [An hon. MEMBER: No.] That is what lawyers call a negative pregnant. What does that "no" mean? Does the hon. Member mean that the promises were not broken; or if they had been kept, does he mean to deny that the results would have been better for the people? I do not know which of these two propositions it is the hon. Member desires to deny. Well, Sir, having so announced himself, the noble Lord proceeded to make statements which have been quoted, and which I shall not repeat. The importance of it is that, having been brought forward in this debate, there has been no attempt to extenuate that language, and no attempt even to explain it away. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary has endeavoured, with more or less success, to explain away a good many things that the noble Lord has said and done; but somehow or other he does not seem to be capable of explaining away the Belfast speech and the Castlereagh incident. He stands by every word of it, and he says that it was entirely justifiable. I do not know whether the adoption of that speech and the principles laid down in it will make the task of governing Ireland—difficult as it is—easier for the Chief Secretary. I admit the difficulty of his position; but that he was obliged to take that speech upon his shoulders was, I must say, to the right hon. Gentleman a great misfortune. What was the object of the noble Lord in going to Belfast? It was to stir up Belfast. Well, there are some places where it is said that it is neither necessary nor desirable to poke up the fire. However, the noble Lord went to Belfast to inquire whether the people were really in earnest, and how far they would go, and he advised them how far they should go. He used one sentence which has not been quoted, but which, in my opinion, contains the pith of what he said. He went, of course, to stir up the people of Belfast against the Home Rule Bill of the late Government. That he was perfectly entitled to do, and I do not desire to be a severe critic of any language which he chose to employ against any measure which he thought mischievous and dangerous and desired to overthrow. That was a perfectly legitimate object. The noble Lord predicted—and in that respect he was a true prophet—that the measure would be defeated. But he went a great deal further than that. It was not at that time certain that it would be defeated, and he contemplated the possibility of its being accepted by the House, and being passed into law by the Commons, by the Lords, and by the Queen.

> "It is right and useful,"

said the noble Lord,

> "that I should add that if the struggle should continue, and if my conclusions should turn out to be wrong,"

—meaning with regard to the defeat of the Bill—

> "then I am of opinion that the struggle is not likely to remain within the lines of what we are accustomed to look upon as Constitutional action."

That is the doctrine of the noble Lord, and it is a doctrine which I think requires to be challenged when propounded and acquiesced in by the responsible Government of the Crown. A measure may be passed, it may receive the assent of all the Estates of the Realm, and it may pass into law, and then the struggle is to continue and is not—

> "To remain within the lines of what we are accustomed to look upon as Constitutional action."

That was not an occasional or accidental phrase. It was uttered in the month of February. The noble Lord returned to the charge, and developed his doctrine further in a letter addressed to his constituents, which appeared in *The Times* of the 8th of May. He contemplated the same possibility of the Home Rule Bill passing into law, and in it he said—"Ulster will not be a consenting party."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): It was not a letter to *The Times.* The letter was addressed to Mr. Young of Glasgow.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It was addressed to some gentleman, but it appeared in *The Times.* If the noble Lord wishes to repudiate it, I will give him every opportunity. The words are somewhat remarkable. The noble Lord, in that letter, said—

> "Ulster will not be a consenting party"

—that is, to an Act of Parliament—

> "Ulster at the proper moment will resort to the supreme arbitrament of force. Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right."

Well, Ulster has fought, and I suppose Ulster is right. I do not see any of the patrons and protectors of the Government, the Liberal Unionists, present. I should like to hear their view of this Constitutional doctrine. I should like to know how it commends itself to the historical Whig Party—the doctrine of the people at the proper moment resorting to the arbitrament of force. But I can guess what their view would be. Upon this very letter, in this House, one of the leading and most weighty Members of that Party—my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James)—made some comments. My right hon. and learned Friend said—

> "I venture to speak very freely, whether I please men or not, and I say that we ought, every one of us, to condemn those foolish, those wicked rumours and statements which are made about Ulster—that the minority in Ireland will finally resort to arms, and that they will be right in so doing. Unreservedly I declare that any man who by word or act encourages such an idea is half a traitor. We have seen action taken against unconstitutional Monarchs, and when such action has been successful we have applauded it; but the proposition now, as I understand it, which these misguided men are using in Ulster, is, that if this House should agree to a legislative measure, and if the House of Lords should assent to it, and the Queen should will it, that measure should be resisted by force of arms."—(3 *Hansard*, [305] 925-6.)

That is the doctrine propounded in this House to-night by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), which was stated by the noble Lord in Ulster, which was repeated in his letter of May 8, and which is repeated again, acquiesced in, and endorsed by the responsible Government of the Queen. [An hon. MEMBER: No.] If the hon. Member was the responsible Government of the Queen I would accept his disclaimer. That is the doctrine—that is the language employed. Now, Sir, this is the comment of my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James) upon this language and doctrine—

> "It is said that such physical force would be used by loyal men, and in one sense so it might be. But is it not apparent to everyone that to use arms against a Constitutional Sovereign, acting in accordance with the will of Parliament, and to whom you say you are loyal, is to make treason doubly dyed?"—(*Ibid.*)

That, Sir, is the comment at least of one of the Unionist Liberals upon the doctrine of the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh

(Colonel Saunderson). But the noble Lord was not content with the language which he addressed to the loyal minority in Ireland; he had also language, not of compliment but of taunts, for the Catholic majority of Ireland and for the Nationalist Party. [An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] Yes; the hon. Member shall hear directly, for I am going to read what the noble Lord said. He pointed the moral of this doctrine of force; he gave the obverse of the medal; he condemned the conduct and the policy of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). For what was it that he condemned it? He said at Belfast—

> "Mr. Parnell is pledged to obtain freedom for his Party. On what title do they base their claim? Do they base it upon acts? Do they seek it in action in the field? It was thus that the Italians won their liberty. It was thus the Greeks won theirs. It was thus that the poor mountaineers of Montenegro won their independence. Mr. Parnell's claim is based on Parliamentary action. They are not like the Italians; they are not like the Greeks; they are not like the hardy mountaineers of Montenegro. They have done no acts of heroism. Their action in the field has not been Parliamentary action."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): May I interrupt the right hon. Gentleman? I assume that the report he is quoting is taken from *The Times*. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes.] Then I wish to inform him that it is altogether a misreport.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am glad, at least, to have obtained one disavowal from Her Majesty's Government, even though it is a disavowal of the report. But I would beg to remind the noble Lord that he is rather an important person, and when he is said to have used language charging men with want of courage, and commenting upon their want of heroism and want of action in the field, and when he is said to have charged them with basing their claims on Parliamentary action—if that is an incorrect report, why did he not correct it? Sir, considering the manner in which this speech has been canvassed, the length of time during which it has been under the observation of Parties, inflamed as they have been by agitation on both sides in Ireland—if language of that kind was incorrect, why did he not correct it before?

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): The report in *The Belfast News Letter* was the same.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: If the noble Lord tells me he did not say it, I feel bound to accept the statement of the noble Lord. All I say is that it is a misfortune that if it was an incorrect report it was not corrected before. Now, Sir, as to this doctrine of the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) —are they so unwise as not to see that it cuts both ways? Do you think that it is safe for one Party to say that if a law be passed which they consider injurious to their interests, a law which, to use the language of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, gives them over to a foreign Power—that therefore they will resist it, and resist it by force? But, supposing that there were another Party in Ireland who believed that the law of England was giving over their country to a foreign Power. What is the foreign Power to which, upon the hypothesis of the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), the Orangemen of Ulster would be given over? It would be at least a power elected by Irishmen. I do not wish to encourage that language, and still less do I desire to deduce the consequences from it which the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh desires to deduce. But everybody knows that at the time of the passing of the Act of Union the principal men of Ireland denounced it, and denied the right of the Irish Parliament to extinguish the existence of that Parliament. That was the language of Grattan, and of Saurin, the Attorney General, and of Plunket, the ancestor of the right hon. and distinguished Gentleman who sits on the Benches opposite. They were betrayed into the same error of saying that Parliament had no right to pass the Act of Union, and having no right they must resist it by force. It is quite plain that a doctrine of that kind is one-sided. If you are to allow the persons affected to judge whether Parliament has or has not the right to pass any particular Act, and to judge whether the consequences of that Act are so serious in their effect upon them that they are entitled to take up arms and resist it by force, why that argument will inevitably be employed by other people who have similar objects. And how can you possibly resist? Supposing that a Party in Ireland, not a minority, but the majority, were to say —"We disapprove of your laws; we think you have passed laws which you have no right to pass, which seriously affect our lives, our liberty, and our property, and we deny your right to pass such laws, and will resist them by force." I say that if such language is to be used by any other Party in Ireland than the spokesman of the Orange Party such language is nothing less than the language of treason and the language of rebellion. But I say that it is a very serious thing that this language of treason and rebellion should receive the countenance of the Executive Government—the Government of the Queen. Well, Sir, but what is this Party which takes upon itself to refuse to obey, or would refuse to obey, the behests of Parliament if Parliament should pass a Bill which, as they say, gives them over to a foreign Government. What is this Orange Party to whose prejudices the noble Lord appealed, and whose passions he went to Belfast to inflame? ["No!"] Sir, I say of that Orange Party that it is, and has long been, the curse of Ireland. [*Cries of* "Question!"] The hon. Member who calls out "Question" does not seem to understand what the question is. The Orange Party I repeat is, and has been, the curse of Ireland. It has done more than any other Body in Ireland to keep alive hatred of race and of religion. It is the representative of the old Protestant ascendancy. [An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] Yes in regard to which the adjective was of very little account. The main force was in the substantive. They cared very little about the Protestantism, but a great deal about the ascendancy. In my opinion, the Orange Society has done more harm in Ireland than all the other secret societies put together. ["Oh!"] Well, I will read what a Protestant Archbishop of Dublin has said of the Orange Society. [*Cries of* "Question!" *and* "Order!"] This is the question. Archbishop Whately said—

> "The very name of Orangeman is a sign which is chosen on purpose to keep up the memory of a civil war which every friend of humanity would wish to bury in oblivion. It is doing what among the heathens was reckoned an accursed thing — keeping a trophy in repair."

It is known that among the Greeks no trophy was allowed to be made of metal; but only of wood, in order that the memory of past feuds might be obliterated. But the Orange Society lives for the express purpose of preventing the memory of past deeds from being buried. It is this government by ascendancy, by Protestant ascendancy, by class ascendancy, by race ascendancy —that has for so many years been the curse of Ireland. It is that which has prevented the great mass of the Irish people from feeling that the English Government was acting in the interests and for the welfare of the people; that they were acting in the spirit of the Orange Societies; and that they were acting by and through, and for a particular section, and that section a minority of the Irish people. Sir, the noble Lord at Belfast appealed to the Orangemen by name to know whether they would, when the occasion arose, be prepared to act like their forefathers in 1798? A more mischievous, a more dangerous, and a more culpable phrase was never employed on such an occasion among such a people and to such an audience. What would be thought of a French statesman who at this day, in a moment of public excitement, was to appeal to the people of Paris, and to ask them whether they were worthy of their forefathers, and whether they were prepared to act like the men of 1793? What were the men of 1798—what were the Orangemen of 1798—whom the noble Lord brings forward as an example, and asks the people of Belfast to imitate? I will read a description of these men of 1798. They are the words of Grattan, and I take them from *Froude's History of Ireland.* They were men who belonged chiefly to the county represented by the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Saunderson). Grattan said—

> "It was a persecution, conceived in the bitterness of bigotry, carried on with ferocious barbarity by a banditti which, being of the religion of the State, had committed with the greatest audacity and confidence the most horrid murders, and had proceeded from robbery and massacre to extermination."

He said—

> "These insurgents, who call themselves Orange Boys, or Protestant Boys, are a banditti

of murderers, committing murders in the name of God."

LORD ALGERNON PERCY (St. George's, Hanover Square): I rise to Order. I wish to know whether the conduct of the Orangemen of 1798 is at all relevant to the Amendment before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment refers to certain precedent circumstances which led up to the riots in Belfast, and it goes on to point out the measures which are necessary for the maintenance of social order. I am bound to say that I do not think a general discussion upon the antecedents of the Orange Party has much connection with the Amendment before the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Of course, Sir, I shall strictly obey your ruling; but this I will ask you. My charge is that the people of Belfast were invited by the noble Lord to imitate their forefathers, the Orangemen of 1798. I therefore ask you, Sir, whether I am not at liberty to point out to the House what was the meaning of that invitation, how it was understood, and what effect it had upon the riots in Belfast? [Mr. SPEAKER made no reply.] Well, Sir, as I understand, you agree that I am justified in pursuing this line of argument. If I am wrong you will tell me so.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman is justified in that line of argument. [*A voice from the Home Rule Benches:* "Shame!"] That is a most unjustifiable expression, and if I knew who used it I would take action. [*Cries of* "Name!"] In the exercise of my duty, I said, when an appeal was made to me, that a discussion of the antecedents of the Orange Society was not pertinent to the Amendment before the House. I say that the Amendment specifically alludes to certain circumstances accountable for the recent riots, and then points out that those circumstances dictate the necessity of special measures being adopted in Belfast; and I do not see that the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman did point to any measures necessary for the rehabilitation of social order in Belfast, or had any special reference to those riots.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Of course, I shall bow absolutely to your ruling. I only wish, Sir, that I had not been called upon to observe upon the language made use of by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), which had a general reference to the Orange Society. If you, Sir, rule that the noble Lord's speech at Belfast——["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is now arguing with the Chair. I have already given my opinion, and it was given in accordance with the demand made to the Chair. I expect the right hon. Gentleman to accept it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I shall absolutely obey your ruling, Sir. My difficulty, however, is to know exactly how I am to discuss this question. The Government appeal to us not to discuss the Amendment particularly in reference to what has taken place in Belfast, and I acquiesced in their view of the matter, because I do not think it is expedient to enter into these matters until the Commission had concluded its inquiry. I certainly did desire—I do not know that I shall be in any way contravening the Speaker's ruling—but I certainly did desire to point out the extreme mischief which has arisen in Belfast from the assumption, as it were, by a small section throughout Ireland, though a large section in Belfast, that they are the special objects of the protection of the English Government, and that they have a right to act upon that view. That, I think, is an extremely dangerous thing; it has led to the disturbances at Belfast, and is likely to lead to disturbances elsewhere. I hope, Sir, although I am not sure, that in following this line of argument I am not going beyond your ruling. The danger of such an assumption and of such a policy was long ago pointed out by Mr. Burke, who said he was afflicted deeply at seeing a small Party in Ireland arrogate to themselves the whole of that Kingdom; that he was more afflicted at seeing that a small faction was able to persuade persons here that in them lay the sole power; and that this strange error, if persevered in, as he was afraid it would be, must obviously ruin both countries. I think there is great wisdom in that sentiment, and I should now really like to elicit from the Government what is to be their course in reference to this matter. Something has been said on the subject of arms. I am afraid that, according to your ruling, Sir, I must not refer to the speech of the noble Lord in Belfast on the subject of arms. But Belfast had been proclaimed, and that Belfast is to a great extent armed cannot be denied. Arms have been used with pernicious and fatal effect; and I should like to know from the Government what measures they are taking, and what measures they intend to take, to disarm Belfast?

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman says my ruling was to the effect that he is not entitled to refer to the speech of the noble Lord at Belfast. What I did say was that it was not pertinent to the Amendment before the House to go into the history of the Orange Society.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then, Sir, I think the position a very difficult one. ["Order!"] I confine myself to the remarks made by the noble Lord in Belfast upon the subject of the Orange Society. What he had said was that he desired the Orangemen of to-day to do as the Orangemen did in 1798. ["Order!"] I understand that I am entitled to say that—namely, that he desired the Orangemen of to-day to do what the Orangemen of 1798 had done. ["Order!"] I understood the Speaker to rule that I was entitled to refer to that, which was what the noble Lord had said in his speech; but you further ruled, Sir—and that ruling I shall obey—that having said that I must not go on—and I shall not go on—to show what the noble Lord meant by that expression—how, in point of fact, the Orangemen of 1798 had acted. ["Order!"] And now I will go to other matters upon which I ask for an expression of the views of the Government. It is quite plain that a great part of the mischief has arisen from the extensive possession of arms by the people of Belfast. It is plain that under the powers of the Proclamation the disarmament of the people can take place. I know all the difficulty there would be in carrying out the process of disarmament; but I think it is of the last importance that we should have some information as to what progress is being made, and what progress is likely to be made, in the disarmament of the unruly people of Belfast. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member seems to think that there are no unruly people in Belfast, and he does not seem to be aware that the unruly people in Belfast are armed. My information leads me to both conclusions. That being so, it would be satisfactory to know from the Government what progress has been made in disarmament—how far the arms have been taken away, and how far persons have been punished for being in possession of arms contrary to the law? Well, Sir, no doubt there is an impression that because a certain class of persons choose to call themselves the loyal minority they therefore ought to be allowed to possess arms. I think that the sooner they are disabused of that impression the better. There are persons who say—"We are the loyal minority, and, therefore, we ought to be allowed to carry arms." It would be a very evil precedent, and would have very pernicious consequences, if it were believed throughout Ireland that the loyal minority were allowed to keep arms contrary to the Proclamation, and if endeavours were made to take the arms of people who do not belong to that particular class in other parts of Ireland. It is quite plain that the restoration of order and the maintenance of peace in Ireland will mainly depend on the belief in the impartiality of the Government, and in the way in which the law is administered. Well, Sir, if I am allowed at all to refer to the noble Lord's speech, I should say that it did not convey an impression to the Irish people of strict impartiality as between the different classes of the community of Belfast. I think that is a very moderate way of stating the proposition. I do not think that if the noble Lord had expressed himself on that occasion in a spirit of strict impartiality he would have given satisfaction to his entertainer, the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). I doubt whether my hon. and gallant Friend, if he will allow me to call him so, with all his excellent qualities, will claim for himself the virtue of impartiality as a distinctive feature of his character. He did not take the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer to Belfast for the purpose of being impartial. He intended him to express a preference—may I be permitted to say a decided preference—for one particular class—I will not name them—for one particular party, for one particular creed, and for one particular section of the community. And the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland says that he entirely accepts that position, and desires to endorse it. I am afraid, however, that that will not convey the impression which I am sure the right hon. Gentleman desires to convey, and upon which I believe he will thoroughly act, of impartiality between all the classes of the community in Ireland. I hope that I have expressed myself in a manner which has neither put me out of Order, or against which any hon. Member can have the slightest reason to object. The virtue of impartiality is a great virtue, but one very difficult to practise, especially in Belfast. What we should like to know, after the doctrines which have been preached in Belfast, and after the acceptance of those doctrines, is whether they are going to be set up, or whether a totally different doctrine and a totally different spirit is going to animate the Government than was shown in Belfast at the time of the visit of the noble Lord? I think we want a little more assurance on that point from the Government. I do not think it was at all satisfactory, much as there was to approve of in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, to hear one part of it. I must say I heard with regret from the Chief Secretary that he adopted the speech of the noble Lord, and that, as far as I could understand, he was prepared to act upon it. If that is the case, I am quite sure it will not conduce to the peace of Ireland. Therefore, I will hope, after all, that it was only a phrase on the part of the Chief Secretary; that he naturally felt indisposed to disavow the language of his Colleague; and that his conduct will be as little conformable to it as possible.

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 127; Noes 225: Majority 98.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barry, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Borlase, W. C.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Burt, T.
Byrne, G. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Commins, A.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly, L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Crilly, D.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. G.
Esslemont, P.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gill, T. P.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gray, E. D.
Harrington, E.
Harris, M.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Hunter, W. A.
Jacoby, J. A.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Leamy, E.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lewis, T. P.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Arthur, W. A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Mason, S.
Mayne, T.
Molloy, B. C.
Montagu, S.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Kerry)
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Parnell, C. S.
Pickard, B.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Power, P. J.
Power, R.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.
Roe, T.
Rountree, J.
Rowlands, J.
Schwann, C. E.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Sheil, E.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stepney-Cowell, Sir A. K.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J
Tanner, C. K.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watson, T.
Williams, A. J.
Williamson, J.
Wright, C.

TELLERS.

Russell, E. R.
Sexton, T.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Bartley, G. C. T.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, H.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beach, W. W. B.
Beadel, W. J.
Beckett, E. W.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.

Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Charrington, S.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Commerell, Adml. Sir J. E.
Compton, F.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corbett, A. C.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Dugdale, J. S.
Duncombe, A.
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Elliot, Sir G.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Feilden, Lt.-Gen. R. J.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitz-Wygram, General Sir F. W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fulton, J. F.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Greenall, Sir G.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Havelock-Allan, Sir H. M.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hoare, S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Lethbridge, Sir R.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, F. W.
Maclure, J. W.
Macnaghten, E.
Mallock, R.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Admiral R. C.
More, R. J.
Morrison, W.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Noble, W.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Powell, F. S.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Reed, H. B.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Round, J.
Royden, T. B.
Russell, T. W.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Taylor, F.
Temple, Sir R.
Theobald, J.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Townsend, F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
West, Colonel W. C.
Weymouth, Viscount
White, J. B.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wilson, Sir S.
Winn, hon. R.
Wood, N.
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:—Colonel KING-HARMAN, Mr. JAMES MACLEAN, Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, Mr. MATTHEWS, Mr. EDWARD STANHOPE, Lord JOHN MANNERS, Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, Mr. ARTHUR BALFOUR, Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Viscount LEWISHAM, and Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS; Five to be the quorum:—To withdraw immediately:—Queen's Speech *referred.*

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.—REPORT.

Report of Address *brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Address be read a second time."

MR. PARNELL (Cork): I wish to know whether the Report of the Address can be taken without Notice and without the consent of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: It is not uncommon that the Report of the Address should be taken immediately the Address has been agreed to.

MR. PARNELL: But with the general consent of the House? I have never seen that the Report of the Address was taken immediately when any considerable section of the House objected to its being taken without Notice. I should apprehend that the same rule would apply as in the Report stage of a Bill, which requires it to be put down on a separate day if it is opposed by any considerable section of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no Notice necessary for the Report of the Address. No Notice is ever given of the Report of the Address; it is brought up as a matter of course immediately after the Address is agreed to.

MR. PARNELL: Then, Sir, I shall move that it be considered at the next Sitting of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Sir, I certainly think I shall not be making an unreasonable request to the hon. Member for the City of Cork and his Friends in asking that the further proceedings on the Address be taken to-night. The hon. Member is aware that we have now occupied 11 Sittings of the House with the discussion on the Queen's Speech—a length of time which has, however, been exceeded on one or more occasions. When I take into consideration the period of the year, the extreme inconvenience imposed on the great body of the House by the excessive prolongation of our Parliamentary proceedings, I own that I am sanguine that the great majority of the House will support me in the appeal which I now make. The hon. Member for the City of Cork will have observed that the matters on which he was more particularly interested have been discussed with great amplitude and deliberation, and there is no further Amendment upon the Paper which raises any Irish subject of great interest. We have no reason to believe that, up to the present moment, the hon. Member for the City of Cork or his Friends desired now to raise any other question which could not be conveniently raised in this House hereafter; and I do not think I am asking the House to do an unreasonable thing when I say that I adhere to my strong opinion that it is greatly to the convenience of the House and to the advantage of the Public Service that the proceedings on the Report of the Address should be brought to a conclusion to-night.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I would point out that an Amendment upon one stage of the Address grows out of what has taken place at the previous stage, and it is obvious that it was impossible to put down an Amendment on Report. Now, the action of the noble Lord this evening, in declining to give any answer to my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), has made me think it desirable that there should be an Amendment to the Report of the Address, and that Amendment I propose to put down if the Report be taken at the next Sitting. The Amendment goes to state that the language used by the noble Lord at Belfast was calculated to provoke a breach of the law, and that it ought to be publicly withdrawn in view of the preservation of the peace in Ireland. I cannot suppose that the noble Lord, when his action is directly challenged, will endeavour to evade it by a Parliamentary manœuvre on the Report of the Address this evening; but if he does, I can only tell him that there are Gentlemen in this part of the House who will exhaust every Form of the House in order to prevent it.

Question put.

CAPTAIN COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.) (seated, and with his hat on): Mr. Speaker, at this moment an hon. Member crossed from the other side of the House and said to me that I had said he was paid for obstructing, and that I was a liar. ["Name, name!"] It was the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner).

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member for Mid Cork made use of any expression of that kind, perhaps he will give some explanation to the House.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) (seated, and with his hat on): The hon. and gallant Gentleman just now stated in the most offensive way that I was paid for trying to keep up a long discussion on the Address, and I told him distinctly that he was a liar. I should not have made use of such strong language had I not been greatly provoked by the offensive way in which the hon. and gallant Gentleman singled me out.

MR. SPEAKER: It will be most convenient that the division should proceed, and that the two hon. Gentlemen should attend in their places immediately after the division.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 121; Noes 228: Majority 107.—(Div. List, No. 9.)

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to revert to the incident which occurred when the division was being taken. The statements of both hon. Members are in possession of the House, and it is therefore for the House to deal with them. I have spoken to both the hon. Members concerned, and the hon. and gallant Gentleman who used the first expression tells me that he did not use it in the sense in which it was understood by the hon. Member. The hon. and gallant Member tells me that he was most unwilling to give pain to the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), and has absolutely and without reserve withdrawn the expression. The hon. Member for Mid Cork also, in the most frank and unreserved manner, withdrew the expression which he used. After that explanation the House may, perhaps, think it right that the incident—a very unfortunate incident—should terminate.

The following is the Entry in the Votes:—

The House was proceeding to a Division when complaint was made by Captain Colomb, Member for the Bow and Bromley Division of the Tower Hamlets, of offensive words addressed to him by Dr. Tanner, Member for Mid Cork, Mr. Speaker called on Dr. Tanner to explain, who addressed the Chair sitting covered. Thereupon Mr. Speaker recommended the House to proceed with the Division before dealing with the subject of the complaint.

The House accordingly *divided;* Ayes 121, Noes 228.

Mr. Speaker then addressed the House, and said that, as the words complained of had been used in the House, the matter came under his authority; that, while the Division was in progress, both the honourable Members had expressed to him their deep regret at the occurrence, and had unreservedly withdrawn the words that had given offence, and tendered their apologies to each other and the House.

Original Question again proposed, "That the Address be read a second time."

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): In the discussion which has just terminated I must say that I shared the expectation that the noble Lord would have taken the opportunity of vindicating himself. ["Question!"] This is the question directly before the House. Hon. Members are proceeding in this matter in exactly the way desired by the noble Lord—namely, that if his conduct in respect of Belfast was to be challenged it should be done in some direct way. Well, Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) gives Notice of an Amendment which arises immediately from these circumstances, in the most convenient way in which it can be done—that is to say, on the Report of the Address; and, therefore, as my hon. Friend's action has been, to some extent, called in question, and as the noble Lord's position is, I think, somewhat serious, I shall conclude with a Motion. I think his action in respect of Belfast really calls for some explanation on his part; and as I think it only right that we should allow him, and perhaps some other Members of the Goverment, to consider the situation, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. James Stuart.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCXEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): It is not necessarily a subject of unmixed regret for myself and my Colleagues and hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House to observe that the chief part in the delay and the arresting of the progress of Public Business is being taken by the prominent Members of the Radical Party. That is a fact of which the country will no doubt take notice. Her Majesty's Government cannot certainly agree to this Motion for the adjournment of the House; and I take this opportunity also of saying that as the Government will distinctly consider that such a Motion as has been given Notice of by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) would be nothing more nor less than a most unprofitable waste of public time, neither I nor any of my Colleagues will be any party to such a waste of time; nor shall we in any way encourage it by taking any part in the discussion which the hon. Member may think it right to raise. I am perfectly aware that it is in the power of hon. Members opposite to bring the Public Business of this country to a standstill. At any rate, Her Majesty's Government know their duty, and will struggle to the best of their power against such tactics, and will resist them.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): My hon. Friend who moved the adjournment, and I, who seconded, are quite willing to accept the responsibility of our actions in this House; but we do not accept the responsibility which the noble Lord has endeavoured to lay upon us—of endeavouring to delay the Business of the House. After the manner in which the language of the noble Lord was characterized by the Leader of the Opposition (Sir William Harcourt) we think that this House has a right to have from the noble Lord some explanation; and as long as the noble Lord chooses to preserve the contemptuous silence which he has adopted, so long may he expect that Members on this side will do what they believe to be their duty in the matter.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): I think, Sir, in view of the past history of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) that it is rather cool of him, to say the least of it, to talk about our bringing the Business of the country to a standstill. It certainly does not lie in his mouth, even if he had some evidence to offer to the House of the truth of his assertion—and he has none—to accuse others of attempting to stop the Business of the country. Now, Sir, it is no question at present of stopping legislation, because we are promised none by the Government. So, therefore, the Business of the country that we are accused of stopping does not consist of legislation. On the contrary, if it had been possible for any portion of the Business of the country to consist of legislation, that legislation would have been stopped by the exertions of the noble Lord. What then, Sir, is the Business that we are stopping—that we are alleged to be stopping? It is the work of voting Supply. Now, none of the Departments are in want of money. [*Cries of* "Question!"] Votes on Account were given —[*Renewed cries of* "Question!" *and* "Order!"]. I am speaking to the Question as far as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, in plea of another day for the discussion of the Amendment of which Notice has just been given by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). I say Votes on Account were given by the late Parliament to the public Departments until next October. Therefore, it cannot be pleaded that there is any urgency for the only Public Business that the Government have called us together to transact. So much for the contention that has been set up by the noble Lord as to stopping the Business of the country. Well, now, I just wish to say another word as to the question of proceeding with the Report of the Address without Notice. I do not in the least, Sir, differ from your ruling; but I will say this—that I have never known any Leader of the House of Commons attempt to proceed with the Report on the Address without Notice, after that course had been objected to by any section, however small, of the Opposition. It has always been held that there might fairly be an interval between the two stages of the Address, in order to give hon. Members time, if they desire it, to raise any further question which might have been brought into more prominent notice in the debates on a previous stage. And this custom has always been recognized by every Leader of the House of Commons. The noble Lord seems to desire to make a new precedent. He was at one time a very ardent upholder of the rights of minorities and freedom of debate; and I would ask him to look back a little on his past, andr emember, although he may be in a very proud position to-night at the head of a victorious Party, that, just as wheels turn, so Governments are occasionally upset, and that he may once again be a Member of a minority, and, perhaps, a small minority. He may then desire to have that fair play for minorities which he is certainly now endeavouring to destroy. Is there any particular advantage in going on with this wrangle? The debate on the different Amendments to the Address has occupied a good many days on technical issues. It has taken 11 days; but other debates have taken a greater number of days than that, when less important events have happened in the country than those which preceded the present state of affairs and the present

Government coming into power. Really, therefore, I think, in view of the fact that this is the last chance we shall have for raising any question connected with the conduct of the noble Lord, in view of the very grave position of affairs in Belfast, and of the intention of the Government to take all the days of private Members in order to proceed with the Business of Supply, it is not an unreasonable request to make to the noble Lord that he should give another day for the discussion of the very important Amendment to be moved by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). I cannot understand how, with any sense of justice, much less with any common sense, the request can be refused. At all events, it is supported by a large minority; and the invariable result of such a state of things is that the Government has, sooner or later, to give way. I shall venture to hope that the noble Lord will give way sooner rather than later, and allow us all to go home.

Question put.

The House *divided*: — Ayes 120; Noes 223: Majority 103.—(Div. List, No. 10.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. DILLWYN (Swansea Town): The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) just now said that within his recollection it had not been the practice of the House to proceed at once with the Report on the Address immediately after the debate. I quite agree with him that it is an inconvenient practice, and it is a course I have never known pursued except by consent. It is a very inconvenient practice, especially when it is obvious that a very large minority of the House are opposed to it. There is another reason why it is desirable that there should be a little time given us between the two stages of the Queen's Speech, and that is because the conduct of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) was called in question by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); and according to your ruling, Sir, which took a great many of us, myself amongst the number, very much by surprise—["Order!"] I do not call your ruling in Question, Sir; I merely say it is a reason why we should have a discussion on the conduct of the noble Lord. That is an important matter, and the country at large will think so as well as this House. It was not discussed in so full a manner as we wished. That is the reason why we think there should be a little more delay. I trust we shall not go on with this wrangle, for, as on similar occasions in the past, I have never known any good come out of them, we cannot expect it now. I venture to hope that the noble Lord will reconsider his decision, and will not go on any further with this wrangle. A great many of us have made up our minds to exhaust every power we possess to secure that the period of time we consider necessary should elapse between the two stages of the Address. I venture now to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I quite admit that when the adjournment of the debate has been moved by a very old Member of the House—by a very experienced Member of the House, and by the last Member from whom I should have expected such a Motion, and when it is supported by a minority of 100, it is, of course, useless for the Government—or the majority rather—to continue the struggle. I always understood that one of the most sacred tenets of the Radical Party was that the majority should prevail, and I observe that the indisposition to protract this debate has been confirmed by a majority numbering more than 100 Members. But if, in the face of that majority, the Radical Party are determined to continue their action, which I can only designate as obstructive——

MR. PARNELL (Cork): I rise to Order, Sir. I wish to know whether the noble Lord is entitled to impute a Parliamentary offence to any Member or Party in this House, the offence of obstruction?

MR. SPEAKER: I have never understood that there was anything un-Parliamentary in attributing that quality to any hon. Member.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I am sorry that the nerves of the hon. Member for the City of Cork are so sensitive. However, I am only going to say that it would be a useless occupation for the House to continue the discussion; and, therefore, the Government will agree to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Before you put that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say, with reference to the question of a separate Sitting for the consideration of the Report on the Address, that it is perfectly true that there are precedents that can be cited for taking the Report on the Address on the day when it is brought in, yet that that is altogether an exceptional course. The precedents were in 1881 and 1883, and they are especially pointed out by Sir Erskine May as exceptional cases. In 1882, on the Question of adjourning the debate——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not rising to a point of Order. The Question before the House is the adjournment of the debate.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Quite so, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House now is the adjournment of the debate.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: That is precisely the point to which I wish to address myself. I did not rise to a point of Order. I am perfectly well aware that the Question is the adjournment of the debate, and as to that I say that the Motion for Adjournment is not by any means unusual. If the noble Lord is in Order in imputing obstruction to a Member or section of this House, I am, at least, equally in Order in repelling the insinuation. In the year 1882, after a debate of six nights on the Address, the Report, which might have been taken at the same Sitting, was deferred from the 14th to the 15th of February. The debate on the Report was started by Sir H. Drummond Wolff. That debate, in which a considerable number of the Members of the present Government took part, lasted for another three nights. How, under these circumstances, the charge of obstruction can be made by any hon. or right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench opposite I cannot understand, and I desire to repel the insinuation.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 3rd September, 1886.

MINUTES.] — PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*) — *Third Reading*—Portsmouth and Hayling Railway*, and *passed.*

PUBLIC BILL — *Committee — Report — Third Reading*—Secret Service (Repeal)* [41], and *passed.*

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*Report—Considered as amended—Third Reading*—Electric Lighting * [278], and *passed.*

Report — Elementary Education Confirmation (Birmingham) * [272]; Elementary Education Confirmation (London) * [273].

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CROSSMAGLEN CONSPIRACY—RELEASE OF THE CONSPIRATORS.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Her Majesty's Government will release those men sentenced to terms of penal servitude for the Crossmaglen conspiracy, after having suffered nearly five years' imprisonment, though no person was injured by any action of the said conspirators?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The cases of these prisoners have been several times considered. Two of them have been released, one three years ago and another last month. The clemency of the Crown was thus exercised in consequence of special circumstances affecting the individual cases. In all the other cases it has been several times decided by more than one Viceroy that the law must take its course.

MR. ALEXANDER BLANE asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that any persons had suffered from the action of those men who had been sent into penal servitude?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I presume that these persons were sentenced for offences against the law.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CORK UNION —STOWAWAYS FROM LIVERPOOL.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the complaints made as to the large number of stowaways from Liverpool (sometimes as many as five per week) landed at Queenstown from the American liners, all of whom being quite destitute become a charge on the rates of the Cork Poor Law Union; and, whether, having regard to the fact that the English Poor Law protects the local rates in converse cases, the Government propose to take any steps to relieve the Cork ratepayers from the burden cast upon them by the state of things in question?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The attention of the late Chief Secretary was called to this matter; but it did not appear that anything could be done to alter what is complained of without a change in the law. Whether legislation on the subject of settlement should be undertaken is a very large question. It certainly cannot be undertaken now. Perhaps the facts as to Cork are of less gravity than the hon. Member supposes. The inquiries made by the Local Government Board show that out of 484 persons landed at Queenstown in the manner complained of in the last five years, only 14 remain in the workhouse; 200 took their departure the day after their admission, and 150 within a few days.

ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is the case that the recent improvement in the pay and allowances of the Army Medical Service, on the faith of which the former dearth has now given place to an ample supply of highly qualified candidates, does not extend to India; whether, in every other branch of the Military Service, the increased cost of living in India is met by largely increased pay and allowances; whether there is any corresponding increase in the pay or allowances of Army Surgeons serving in India, and whether it is true that they are subjected to many expenses in the discharge of their duties from which other Officers are exempt; and, whether he will cause inquiry to be made as to the facts, with a view to the redressing of any grievance that may exist?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): In 1884, when the home rates of pay of the Army Medical Service were raised, no change was made in the Indian rates of pay, which were considered already adequate. In every branch of the Military Service Indian rates of pay of officers are higher than home rates to meet the increased cost of living in India. The Medical Branch is no exception; the rates of pay in India are higher than at home. I am not aware that Army Surgeons serving in India are subjected to expenses in the discharge of their duties from which other officers are exempt. As the facts of the case are well known it is not intended to make any inquiry into the subject.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—HIGH OFFICIALS IN PRIVATE FIRMS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the judgment of the Lord Chief Justice of England, concurred in by the Hon. Mr. Justice Denman, in the case of "Armstrong and others," v. "Armit and others;" whether his attention has been called to those parts of the said judgment in which—

> "(a.) It has been held that it is a matter of National importance that the representative of a firm interested in the manufacture of ordnance should not have to examine guns on behalf of the Government for our National defences. (b.) That persons should not be allowed to occupy a double capacity, that is to say, that members of the Government Department that has to see that proper guns are supplied should not also be interested in the contracting Company who have obtained from the Government the right, privilege, and profit of manufacturing guns for our National defences;"

and, whether, in view of the foregoing judicial opinion, he will take steps to prevent manufacturers, or those in any way interested in firms contracting with the Government, from sitting either as members or associated members of the Ordnance or other Committee having for its object the recommendation for adoption in Her Majesty's Service of warlike or other stores supplied by said firms?

Mr. WOODALL (Hanley): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question, it will be convenient to ask him whether his attention has also been called to the fact that the Lord Chief Justice on the same occasion is reported to have spoken of the Ordnance Committee as having "to select particular firms to supply ordnance;" and, whether Lord Coleridge was accurate in assuming that any such function appertained to the Ordnance Committee?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the hon. Gentleman opposite, my attention was not drawn to this particular paragraph in the judgment of the Lord Chief Justice; but I have no hesitation in saying that it is no part of the functions of the Ordnance Select Committee to select firms as contractors for the supply of ordnance or any ammunition or materials for the use of the Services. As a matter of fact they have no voice in the matter. I have, of course, seen the reports in the newspapers of the judgments of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Denman to which the hon. and gallant Member refers; and I give my cordial assent to the general principles laid down by the learned Judges. They had, however, only a portion of the case before them, on which, as the hon. and gallant Member is aware, a trial is now pending; and it is my duty, therefore, to refrain from expressing any opinion, or of taking any action on the facts so far as they have been ascertained. I shall, however, be prepared to state on Votes 12 and 15 of the Army Estimates the circumstances under which my Predecessors in Office invited the assistance of Sir William Armstrong and Captain Noble, of the Armstrong Company, and Mr. Leece, and subsequently Mr. Gledhill, of the Whitworth Company, in considering designs for guns.

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—CASTLEBAR DISPENSARY.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) (for Dr. Kenny) (Cork, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the usual practice of appointing the medical officer of a dispensary district in Ireland to take charge of the Constabulary within his district was not followed in the case of Dr. William Jordan, recently appointed to the Castlebar, county Mayo, Dispensary; and, whether it is a fact that Dr. Jordan applied for the position, which had been for many years past held by his predecessor in the dispensary?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he was informed that the usual practice was not as stated in the Question. The Inspector General of Constabulary received the names of the medical gentlemen who were available. It was the case that Dr. Jordan applied for the appointment; but the Constabulary Authorities did not consider him the most suitable man for the appointment. He was a very junior practitioner, and, in fact, only received his diploma a few weeks ago.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—SHOOTING AT THE PERSON—CASE OF DENIS MURPHY.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If a bill of indictment against a man named Denis Murphy, for shooting at Mr. William Cotter, with intent to kill, was sent before the Grand Jury of the county Cork at the recent Court of Assize held in the city of Cork; if Murphy had been returned for trial from the Bantry Petty Sessions, at which the resident magistrates adjudicated; if Mr. Cotter positively swore before the grand jury that Murphy fired at him; if another witness swore that he heard Murphy state he intended shooting Mr. Cotter; whether Sergeant Binns made an information to the effect that Murphy admitted having fired the shot from a revolver at the instigation of his brother; if Constable Binns found a revolver at Murphy's house; whether, notwithstanding all this proof against Murphy, the grand jury ignored the bill against him; and, what action the Government intend taking in the matter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): A bill of indictment against Denis Murphy for firing at William Cotter with intent to kill was laid before the County Cork Grand Jury at the last Assizes, and was ignored. Murphy had been returned for trial on this charge from Bantry Petty Sessions, and among the depositions was one by Sergeant Binns, in which he swore that Murphy when asked in his own house gave him a revolver, and afterwards on the way to the barracks told him that he had fired the shot against the road or ditch, by direction of his brother Timothy, to frighten Cotter. I do not know, and I am precluded from inquiring, what occurred before the Grand Jury; but having read the depositions, I can conceive that the Grand Jury had good grounds for ignoring the bill. Under these circumstances, I do not intend to take any further action in the matter.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) inquired whether any Resident Magistrates were sitting at the Petty Sessions at Bantry?

Mr. HOLMES replied that he believed there was one Resident Magistrate there on the occasion of the man being committed.

Mr. GILHOOLY: There were two.

Mr. HOLMES: Oh! it is quite possible.

Mr. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) asked whether any of the magistrates who adjudicated at the Bantry Petty Sessions were members of the Grand Jury?

Mr. HOLMES: I cannot say.

RAILWAYS—MIXED TRAINS—CONTINUOUS BRAKES.

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, in view of the fact that mixed trains, composed of passenger and goods carriages, are a source of danger to the public and to those employed by the Railway Companies, from the increased risk in the composition of such trains, of their either breaking loose or the breaking of axles, and also from the difficulty of stopping them conveniently at the platforms, he proposes to make it obligatory on Railway Companies to minimise such danger to the public and the Companies' servants by having continuous brakes fitted on all trains composed of waggons and carriages?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Board of Trade have no authority to impose upon Railway Companies the use of any particular form of brake. The matter referred to by the hon. Member is one of much importance and of no little difficulty; but I can promise him that the subject shall receive careful consideration.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NEWRY UNION—POOR RATE FOR THE CAMLOUGH DIVISION.

Mr. ALEXANDER BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the ratepayers of Camlough Division of the Newry Union complained at the Boardroom of the last made rate for the Camlough Division having been double of last year; and, whether the excess is solely due to the official staff of that Union costing more than the support of the paupers; and if the Government will direct an inquiry?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, it was a fact that some ratepayers of the Camlough Division of the Newry Union complained at the Board Room of the last made rate for the division having been double that of last year. It appeared, however, to be inevitable. The Local Government Board reported that the expenses of both outdoor and indoor relief were exceptionally large, and that the increase of the rates was not due in any way to the expenses of the official staff, which, including the expenses of two dispensary doctors, amounted to only 2*d.* in the pound.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS IN KILKENNY COUNTY.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How many persons have been evicted within the last three weeks at Carrigeen, Luffany, and Ballygory, county Kilkenny; at whose suit; and, what was, in each case, the yearly rent, the valuation, the law costs, and the costs of carrying out the evictions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): One eviction only took place in the time and locality mentioned. It was at the suit of Messrs. Lecky. The yearly rent was £1, and the valuation 15*s.* The law costs were £2 10*s.* 10*d.* The tenant had paid no rent for seven years. Since the eviction he has paid the amount demanded and been reinstated. The amount of the costs incurred by the Constabulary for conveyance, &c. had not yet been ascertained.

POST OFFICE—POSTAGE OF CIRCULARS.

Sir **JULIAN GOLDSMID** (St. Pancras, S.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether there is any and, if any, what objection to adopting the French system of allowing circulars to be sent in open envelopes at the lower (viz. halfpenny) rate; and, if not, whether he will introduce it?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): I would remind the hon. Member that a similar Question was asked on Tuesday last by the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Tomlinson). I do not think I can add anything to the reply then given; but if the hon. Gentleman desires I will repeat it.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—LIST OF VOTERS—NORTH LEITRIM.

Mr. **CONWAY** (Leitrim, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the alleged irregularities in the way the Parliamentary Lists of Voters have been distributed in Leitrim North by the Clerk of the Peace; whether instructions will be given to the said Clerk of the Peace to substitute the proper lists for the lists of the Kiltyclogher and Kinlough polling stations at present exhibited at the Glenfarne and East Bars Post Offices in the Manorhamilton District; and, whether care will be taken in future to give the electors in their respective polling districts a fair opportunity to examine the Parliamentary Lists of Voters for such districts?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.) was understood to say that the Clerk of the Peace had acted under a misapprehension in the matter, and care would be taken by the officer not to repeat the irregularities.

THE FRANCHISE ACTS, 1885—EXTRA REMUNERATION TO POOR LAW OFFICIALS.

Mr. **MACARTNEY** (Antrim, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, having regard to the additional and very onerous duties imposed upon Poor Law officials in Ireland under the Franchise Acts of 1885, and to the great reluctance manifested by Boards of Guardians to vote adequate remuneration in such cases, the Government proposes to make a grant on this account for the present year as was done in 1885?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The Local Government Board do not find that Boards of Guardians generally are disinclined to afford fair remuneration to the Poor Law officials for the duties in question, and it is not proposed this year to ask Parliament to pass a Vote, as was done in the very exceptional circumstances of last year.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—TRAWLING IN GALWAY BAY.

Sir **THOMAS ESMONDE** (Dublin, Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, since the report of the Commission on Scotch Fisheries relative to trawling, scientific opinion has changed considerably as to the injurious effect of trawling on coast fisheries; if trawling has been put a stop to in different parts of Scotland in consequence; if it is a fact that the Coast Guard Officer in Galway stated in a report that the fishing in Galway Bay has been destroyed by trawling; if it is a fact that the Galway fishermen are very much opposed to trawling; and, if the Government can induce the Fishery Commissioners in Ireland to limit the operations of trawling boats in Galway Bay?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The Inspectors of Irish Fisheries are not aware that scientific opinion with regard to the injurious effects of trawling has changed as suggested. If the hon. Baronet has any information on the subject, perhaps he will be good enough to communicate it to the Government or to the Inspectors. The bylaws prohibiting trawling on the Scotch Coast are expressly described by the Scotch Inspectors in their last annual Report now before the House as being merely experimental. It is true that the Galway fishermen are opposed to trawling, and that the Coastguard officer at Galway has expressed the opinion that it is injurious; but this officer was produced as a witness at the inquiry recently held at Galway, when the value of his opinion might have been tested. No evidence was given on that occasion which would justify the Inspectors in limiting the operations of trawling boats in Galway Bay.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—MARRIED COUPLES IN UNION WORKHOUSES.

MR. CHARLES GRAY (Essex, Maldon) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the Local Government Board is assured that in all union workhouses such accommodation is provided that no married couples are separated who, by being over sixty years of age, have the legal right to live together?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): Last November the Local Government Board issued a Circular to Boards of Guardians, calling their attention to the duty devolving upon them under the statutory provisions with reference to the non-separation in the workhouse of husband and wife in certain cases. From the replies that have been received, there would not appear to be that anxious desire which some people think exists on the part of these aged couples to live together. On the contrary, over and over again it is stated that where provision is made it is not availed of. One clerk to a Board reported that in the only instance within his knowledge in which the advantages of association were adopted by an old pair in a certain workhouse they lived together for about a year; but the experiment was not attended with a satisfactory result. They were so constantly quarrelling that after repeated attempts to reconcile them they desired to be placed in the ordinary wards, and they remained there. [An hon. MEMBER: Where was that?] In Camberwell. We have no reason to believe that any cases exist where the accommodation is desired and is not furnished; but if the hon. Gentleman knows of any case, and will inform me of it, I will at once cause inquiries to be made and see that the provisions of the law are fulfilled.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS AT GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that, out of the adult male population in the recent Gweedore evictions, a large number of persons have, as an act of charity, been given free passages to England, per steamer from Bunbeg, to enable them to earn at harvesting work money wherewith to redeem the evicted holdings?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that during the last few days 130 persons have left Gweedore for the purpose of engaging in harvest work in Scotland. That is usual at this season of the year, and there is no reason to suppose that there is any particular object in view on the present occasion. Some of those persons were amongst the persons recently evicted. I understand that the parish priest lent them money to pay the passages.

ENGLAND AND THE COLONIES — IMPERIAL FEDERATION—A JOINT COMMITTEE.

SIR SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government have decided to appoint a Committee of both Houses of Parliament to inquire and report upon the question of Imperial Federation between the United Kingdom and her Colonies?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My hon. Friend will, I am sure, understand that it would be impossible, without risk of misapprehension, to state the views of Her Majesty's Government upon this subject within the limits of an answer to a Question. But at present I can only say that, in accordance with the promise given by the Prime Minister to the deputation at the Colonial Office, the Government have taken this matter into their very careful consideration.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ACCIDENTS IN MINES—THE REPORT.

MR. ARTHUR WILLIAMS (Glamorgan, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the final Report of the Accidents in Mines

Commission is out of print; and, if so, whether the Government will take steps for having an edition printed which will enable the large body of Her Majesty's subjects, who are deeply interested in its contents and recommendations, to have access to them?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): No, Sir; this Report is not yet out of print, there being still about 160 copies left in stock. When this stock is exhausted or much reduced it will be time to consider the advisability of republishing the Report only, without the evidence and illustrations, as a cheap work.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND)—CORRUPT PRACTICES—LEGISLATION.

MR. LACAITA (Dundee) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, at an early date next Session, a Bill to restrain corrupt practices at municipal elections in Scotland?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I may remind the hon. Member that in 1884 the proposal of the then Government to extend to Scotland the provisions of the Bill relating to corrupt practices at municipal elections was resisted by some of the Scotch Members; but I will examine into the subject during the Recess, and deal with it according to the result of my inquiries.

REGISTRATION OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES—THE REGISTRAR.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is, as alleged, true, that delays take place in the office of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, in the registration of rules and amendments; what are the causes of such delays, if any, and whether they are removable; and, whether he will cause to be furnished a Return of all registrations of rules or alterations effected or applied for during the last five years, stating, in each case, when the rules or alterations were first lodged for registration, when the registration was or may be expected to be completed, and the causes of any delay?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.), in reply, said, it was not the fact that any avoidable delay took place. If the hon. Gentleman would furnish him with the particulars of any case in which he thought there had been unreasonable delay, he (Mr. Jackson) would make inquiries on the subject.

FRANCO-CHINESE COMMERCIAL TREATY — PROHIBITION OF OPIUM TRAFFIC BETWEEN TONQUIN AND CHINA.

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in the Commercial Treaty lately concluded between France and China, to regulate trade between Tonquin and China, the 14th Article provides for the total prohibition of trade in opium between Tonquin and China; and, whether he will lay Copies of the Treaty upon the Table?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The 14th Article of the Commercial Treaty between France and China engages that neither foreign nor Native opium shall be allowed to be conveyed overland across the frontiers of Tonquin and three Provinces of China named therein for purchase or sale. There will be no objection to lay upon the Table a copy of the Treaty, if the hon. Member chooses to move for it.

BURMAH—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—CAPTAIN ADAMSON.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether his attention has been called to a Memorandum of the Governor General of India, dated 25th February 1886, in which His Excellency recommends "that great pains should be taken to administer justice (in Upper Burmah) in such a manner as will stand the test of searching public criticism;" whether it is true that for months after His Excellency's recommendation Native prisoners in Mandalay were tried by Captain Adamson, an Artillery officer destitute of legal training, privately at his own house, and without right of appeal; whether any record of the evidence was or is kept; whether the system continues in operation; and, whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the number of prisoners tried by Captain Adamson, since February last, who have been shot or hanged, the number of prisoners sentenced by him to transportation and imprisonment, and the number of thousands of years to which these aggregate sentences amount, and the number of prisoners flogged, with the aggregate number of lashes inflicted?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): I cannot identify the particular Memorandum referred to in the Question; but the words quoted correctly represent the views which the Viceroy has always held on the administration of justice in Upper Burmah. Captain Adamson has been in civil employment in Burmah since 1871. He was seven years an Assistant Magistrate, chiefly stationed at Rangoon; three years Assistant Commissioner, and nearly five years Deputy Commissioner. At the beginning of this year he was selected, in consequence of his long legal training and experience, for the responsible position of Deputy Commissioner at Mandalay. He remained at this post until compelled by illness to quit it. Trials sometimes took place at his private house, because Court accommodation was limited, and other officers were trying cases in the regular Court. Captain Adamson's house was at all times open to the public. Records of the trials were kept. No radical alteration of the system has been made; but the Government of India are now engaged in framing laws and regulations for the government of Upper Burmah. The Secretary of State is making full inquiry into the administration of the Criminal Law in Upper Burmah; but I cannot undertake to lay any Return upon the Table which would appear to give any countenance to the charge against Captain Adamson suggested in the Question. The Government of India have had full confidence in his zeal, integrity, consideration for the people, and desire to do justice.

DR. CAMERON gave Notice that in consequence of the answer of the hon. and learned Gentleman he would call attention to the subject on the Report of the Address.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—CYPHER TELEGRAMS.

LORD HENRY BRUCE (Wilts, Chippenham) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to Belfast riots, Whether important official telegrams might not in future be written in cypher?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir; official telegrams are frequently sent in cypher.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—CAPITATION GRANT TO THE VOLUNTEERS.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is possible, and if he will so modify the Army or other Estimates as will enable him to increase the Capitation Grant to the Volunteers by ten shillings per man?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster) (who replied) said: No, Sir; I must refer the hon. Member to the answer I gave to the Question of the noble Lord the Member for East Hampshire (Viscount Wolmer) on the 23rd of August. The Returns not being complete, I am unable to come to any decision at present.

POST OFFICE—COUNTRY TELEGRAMS.

MR. COCHRANE-BAILLIE (St. Pancras, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the benefits recently granted to the public by the introduction of a reduced charge for the transmission of telegrams could be further extended to the poorer classes in country districts, by a proportionate reduction of the rates for the porterage of telegrams?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to my hon. Friend, I have to say that the charge for porterage of telegrams beyond the free delivery is 6*d*. a-mile under three miles, and I scarcely think it would be possible to offer less to any person engaged to deliver a message. The porterage is paid to the messenger, and does not belong to the Department. The rate for a mounted messenger is, as a rule, 1*s*. a-mile from the office door; but in some cases owners of horses are willing to take rather less, and the public get the benefit. I do not think the charge excessive for the service rendered.

ADMIRALTY—FREEING OF HASLAR BRIDGE, PORTSMOUTH.

SIR SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the Lords of the Admiralty, on their approaching visit to Portsmouth, will consider the question of freeing the Haslar Bridge, which would be a boon to the relatives and friends of seamen and others in the Royal Navy, who are now required to pay toll in going to and returning from the Royal Naval Hospital?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): We will consider the question of freeing Haslar Bridge during our inspection at Portsmouth; but as it will involve a considerable sum of money I am not sanguine that it can be done.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—THE ALLOTMENT RETURNS—RETURNS FOR UNIONS AND PARISHES INSTEAD OF BY COUNTIES.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucester, Tewkesbury) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the materials collected by the Agricultural Department would render it practicable to supplement Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6, of the Allotment Returns just presented to Parliament, by similar Tables giving the same information for each union or parish, instead of for counties only, so as to enable a better opinion to be formed as to the localities in which a deficiency of allotment or garden land for the agricultural labourers may exist; and, whether he would cause such further Tables to be presented to Parliament?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.): The Statistical Department is now fully engaged in preparing the Agricultural Returns for the year; but I have directed inquiries to be made into the practicability of compiling the information asked for within a reasonable time after those Returns have been issued.

POST OFFICE—THE GENERAL POST OFFICE—THE CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether recently a telegraph clerk, who had been absent from duty for a week under a medical certificate of sickness, was peremptorily ordered, a few days after a fresh medical certificate had been furnished, to present himself for examination by the chief medical officer

of the Post Office; whether he had been advised by his medical attendant to confine himself to the house; whether, on presenting himself as directed, he was told that he was "making a lot of fuss about nothing," and that he must resume his duty on the following Monday; whether he resumed his duty accordingly; whether he was placed on one of the heaviest wires in the Division; and, whether within a fortnight from the day of resuming duty he was dead?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): I have endeavoured to identify the case to which the hon. Member refers, and think he must allude to a telegraphist named Billinghurst, who died on August 9. The circumstances respecting his illness are not stated accurately in the Question. The facts are as follows:—Mr. Billinghurst was absent from duty from July 10 to July 23, on account of deranged liver. He attended to see the medical officer on July 23, said "he was feeling much better," and should be able to resume duty on Monday, July 26, when he took his ordinary circuit in accordance with the duty list. He remained on duty till Saturday, July 31, but consulted the medical officer on July 27, and again an July 30, which was the last occasion on which he saw the medical officer. He did not ask for further leave of absence, but for a change to Dover as soon as could be arranged. On Monday, August 2, he sent a medical certificate stating that he was not fit to attend. On August 5 he was written to to attend to see the medical officer if well enough. He did not attend, but sent a certificate to say he was suffering from fever. On the 9th he was asked to forward a certificate of the nature of the fever. The reply was a certificate stating he died on the 9th of typhoid fever. The words imputed to the medical officer are absolutely denied.

MR. PICKERSGILL gave Notice that in Committee of Supply he would call attention to this case and also to other cases of alleged misconduct on the part of the chief medical officer of the Post Office.

PHARMACY ACT, 1868—PRESCRIPTIONS BY CHEMISTS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, If the Government are aware that numbers of chemists in London prescribe medicinally for all sorts of diseases; if it is legal for chemists who have no medical or surgical degree to prescribe and make up medicines, in many of which poisonous drugs are used; and, if the Government will take steps to put an end to this practice, now that proper medical advice can be obtained for small fees?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The Government have no special information upon the subject referred to in the first part of the Question, though it is very probable that chemists are in the habit of prescribing medicinally to persons coming to their shops. As to the second part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the provisions of the Pharmacy Act, 1868, by which it is made unlawful for persons since 1868, unless registered under that Act, to retail, dispense, or compound the poisons referred to in the Schedule of that Act and in subsequent Resolutions of the Pharmaceutical Society approved by the Privy Council. I have only to add that the Government have under consideration the question of further regulating the sale of poisons.

THE MAURITIUS—OFFICIAL DISSENSIONS.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether an outbreak of disturbance has invariably attended Mr. Clifford Lloyd's appearance as an official in every position to which he was appointed; whether, in the Island of the Mauritius, an amendment to the Address, expressing confidence in Sir John Pope Hennessy and approval of his past administration, was moved by Sir Virgile Naze, and passed by a majority of the representative Members; and, whether an address of confidence in the Governor, signed by 6,000 of the inhabitants, was sent to and received by the Colonial Office?

An hon. MEMBER asked whether it was not the fact that Sir John Pope Hennessy got into great difficulties while Governor of Hong Kong?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I have already informed the House that the position of affairs in the Mauritius being still under consideration, I hoped that I might be permitted, for the present, not to answer Questions calculated to prejudice either party to the dispute. It is, however, only fair that I should say that the unfortunate state of affairs in the Mauritius existed long before Mr. Clifford Lloyd's advent.

Subsequently,

DR. TANNER said, he felt bound to complain that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had not answered the Question which he had put on the Paper with reference to the relations between Mr. Clifford Lloyd and Sir John Pope Hennessy.

MR. E. STANHOPE: I cannot think it likely to promote the interests of good government in Mauritius that I should answer these Questions. I must decline to answer Questions which have as their object either to support or attack Sir John Pope Hennessy on the one hand, or Mr. Clifford Lloyd on the other.

DR. TANNER: Am I to understand that the right hon. Gentleman declines to answer the Question?

MR. E. STANHOPE: I am, of course, in the hands of the House; but as far as I am concerned I entirely decline to answer.

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—RETURN OF ACCOUNTS.

DR. CLARK (Caithness) asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he is aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists at the delay in issuing the Return of the Accounts of Life Insurance Companies, as expressed in the various articles in the Insurance Press on the matter; and, if it is possible to issue the Return earlier?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: The Board of Trade have not received any complaints on the subject of this Question, and their attention had not been called to the notices in the Insurance Press until the Question was placed on the Paper by the hon. Member. Arrangements have been made which will, we hope, insure the presentation of the Life Assurance Returns at an earlier period in future years.

BURMAH—INUNDATION OF MANDALAY.

MR. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne) asked the Under Secretary of State for

India, Whether any further intelligence has been received respecting the inundation of Mandalay; how many lives have been lost; and, what steps have been taken to relieve the destitution occasioned by the accident amongst the native population, and to ascertain the causes of the disaster?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The Viceroy telegraphed on the 27th August that the floods had fallen six feet. Only 12 bodies have been found, and the District Officer reports that he does not think that more than this number have perished, search having been continued for 10 days. As regards the relief of the destitute, a pound of rice and half-an-anna is given daily to all applicants, who average about 300 a day. There is a great deal of work now going on in the neighbourhood of Mandalay and in other districts, on roads. A Committee has been appointed to investigate the circumstances of the bursting of the embankment. A similar accident occurred in 1877, when the flood was three feet less than on the present occasion.

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—LEGISLATION.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the President of the Local Government Board, If the Government intend next Session to introduce a Bill dealing with the present system of registration of Parliamentary Voters?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I am afraid I cannot give to the hon. Gentleman any undertaking as to the Business of next Session. The Government anticipate that there will be ample time in which to deal with this question before another General Election.

ADMIRALTY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS IN TROOPSHIPS.

MR. M. HEALY (Cork) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether any, and, if so, what, steps were taken in the matter of providing troop ships with Catholic chaplains, pursuant to the undertaking given by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 27th March 1882; whether it is the fact that the Catholic seamen and marines of the Channel Fleet have no means of attending mass on Sunday unless when in port; whether it frequently happens that the Fleet is not in port on Sunday; whether it is the fact that, when the Catholics on board have no opportunity of attending service on shore, they are required to attend the service of the Protestant chaplain, or whether it is the practice for them to do so; whether it is the fact that there are at present over 400 Catholic seamen and marines on board H.M.S. *Agincourt;* and, whether the Government will undertake to provide every troop ship having a considerable proportion of Catholics on board with a Catholic chaplain?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The steps taken were that whenever more than 300 Roman Catholic soldiers were embarked in any of the Indian troopships, a Catholic chaplain should be sent in the ship and the necessary accommodation provided for him. The Catholic seamen and marines of the Channel Fleet have no means of attending mass on Sundays, except when in port. The requirements of the Service frequently necessitate the Fleet being at sea on Sundays. It is not the case that Catholics are required to attend the service of the Protestant chaplain at any time, and it is not the practice for them to do so. The number of Catholics on board the *Agincourt* at the present time is 127, out of a complement of 883, which is much above the average, Roman Catholics constituting only 10 per cent of the Fleet generally. The Admiralty have not added Roman Catholic chaplains to the complement of troopships, but a cabin will be provided for them when the Secretary of State for War considers it desirable that a Roman Catholic chaplain should accompany the troops.

MR. M. HEALY said, he had not understood the noble Lord to answer that part of the Question which inquired whether it was not the practice to make Roman Catholics attend the services of the Protestant chaplains?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he had answered that they were not required to attend the services, and it was not the practice to make them do so.

MR. M. HEALY: Is the noble Lord aware whether it is the practice for them to attend?

[No reply.]

ADMIRALTY—ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNS OF SHIPS.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is true, as reported in the American press, that the Secretary of the Navy of the United States recently stated in Congress that, owing to the influence of Messieurs. W. G. Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company (Limited), an agent of the Navy Department of the United States Government had been granted access to the confidential designs of the ships of the British Navy at the Admiralty, in London; and, whether the price paid by the said agent to Messieurs. Armstrong, Mitchell, and Company, for a ship's design, was not £5,000?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I have to reply to the first part of the Question that the statement referred to is not true. The Naval Attaché of the United States Legation has, on application to the Secretary of the Admiralty, received the sanction of the Board to certain information in connection with the construction of some of Her Majesty's ships being furnished to him, as has been done in the case of the Naval Attachés of other countries on their official application. The Admiralty has no information as to the business transactions of Messrs. Armstrong, Mitchell, and Co. with the Government of the United States. As this is not the first Question put to me imputing either breach of trust or improper conduct to Admiralty officials, I hope that before any further charges of the same kind are made the Member putting the Question will take the trouble of ascertaining whether there is reasonable ground for assuming that there is any truth in the allegations with which he associates his name.

NAVY—H.M.S. "PHAETON."

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, with reference to the *Phaeton* at Portsmouth, and the recent several "breaks down" of her machinery, Whether he is satisfied that due caution was observed by those responsible for taking over the engines from the contractors before they were finally accepted; whether the last breaking of one of her pistons and cylinders is due to some inherent mechanical defect in the engines themselves, and such as no caution on the part of the engineers's staff on board could foresee or guard against; whether, immediately prior to the ship being commissioned, her engine-room staff of officers and stokers were drafted off for service in other ships with the sole exception of the chief engineer, thereby necessitating the appointment of other engineers and men entirely unacquainted with the engines, and depriving the chief engineer of the assistance to which he had been accustomed; whether such action meets with his approval, and whether it may not have contributed to her break down; and, whether the other ships of *Phaeton* class are engined by the same firm of contractors, and whether any serious complaints have been received in respect of their machinery?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Due caution was not observed in certain particulars by those responsible for taking over the engines of the *Phaeton* from the contractors. The several officers concerned have been censured by the Admiralty, and the chief engineer has been removed from the ship. The last accident, whereby one of the cylinders was injured, was caused by the breaking of a piston rod. The rod where broken shows the existence of a defect not previously apparent, but which may have existed for some time. The defect is one which it would be difficult for the engineer staff on board to foresee and guard against, but the subject is being now inquired into. With the exception of the chief engineer, and sometimes one other, there is no engine-room staff actually belonging to a ship of this size until she is put into commission. The staff necessary for the efficient maintenance of the machinery is supplied by the Steam Reserve, and when orders are received to commission the ship the men who have been employed upon her are as far as possible selected to compose her engine-room staff. In the case of the *Phaeton* the men who had been so employed had, from various causes, been drafted away before the order was received to commission her, with the exception of three stokers who formed part of her staff. None of the accidents that subsequently occurred in the ship can be attributed to this cause. The *Leander* and *Arethusa* are of the *Phaeton* class and were built and engined by the same contractors, Messrs. Napier, of Glasgow, but no serious complaints have been received in respect of the machinery of these two ships.

Admiral FIELD asked whether the cylinder of the *Phaeton*, as well as the piston, had broken?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, there was a crack in one of the cylinders.

BULGARIA—MESSAGE OF PRINCE ALEXANDER TO THE CZAR.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham) asked, Whether the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs could tell the House whether the message of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria to the Emperor of Russia and His Imperial Majesty's reply, which had appeared in the newspapers, were authentic?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): We have been informed that some such communications have passed, but we are not in official possession of the documents. The hon. Member will have observed that they were published in the official *Gazette* at St. Petersburg.

MOTION.

——o——

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—RESOLUTION.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.), in rising to move—

> "That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed; that the Standing Order, No. 21, relating to Notices on going into Committee of Supply on Monday and Thursday be extended to the other days of the week,"

said: In proposing this Motion, which has been on the Paper for some days, perhaps the House will allow me to support it with a few preliminary remarks. I am not altogether without hope—though possibly the hope may seem a bold one—that this Motion may be agreed to without a division. The Motion, it will be observed, is in absolute and logical connection with the meeting of Parliament at this time of year. The policy of calling Parliament together at this time of year has been questioned in the course of preceding debates, and it undoubtedly is a policy which is open to argument. There is much to be said both for and against it. Undoubtedly, it involves great personal inconvenience and sacrifice to all hon. Members in this House, and the season of the year is, on many grounds, unsuited to the transaction of Public Business. On the other hand, there are strong reasons why the Government should not have postponed for any considerable length of time obtaining from Parliament the money necessary for the Services during the current year. The course which the Government adopted is exactly analogous to that adopted in 1841. In that year the Government of Lord Melbourne, after a General Election, was defeated on a Vote of Confidence on August 27. The Government resigned on August 30; the Writs for the election of Ministers who had accepted Office were issued on September 8, and Parliament assembled on September 16 for the transaction of indispensable Public Business. Sir Robert Peel then stated that it was the intention of the Government to limit the demand upon Parliament to the transaction of so much of the Business of Supply as had been left over by the outgoing Government, and, after a slight protest from Lord John Russell, that course was agreed to by the House without a division. But not only is our course founded upon the precedent of 1841; it is also, I submit, a strictly Constitutional course. The present Government, when they came into Office, could not feel any certainty that, as a Government, they would possess the confidence of Parliament; and I think that it will be apparent that a Government in that position would not have been acting in accordance with Constitutional precedents in spending during a period of several months large sums of public money. Moreover, we should have been spending large sums of public money in connection with the government of Ireland before one single important Irish Vote had been submitted to Parliament. We might have gone on spending money by means of Votes on Account, and the Irish Representatives would have had no opportunity of controlling the expenditure. That, I think, would not have been a Constitutional course. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) remarked last night that there was no Business of importance now before Parliament, and that the necessary Business of Supply might well have been put off until October. I do not think that the hon. Member will maintain that view on reflection. Suppose that Parliament had not been called together until October 1, and suppose that the debate on the Address had occupied the same amount of time which has been occupied recently, the month of October would probably have been almost entirely taken up, and it would have been out of the power of Parliament to deal efficiently with the Supplies of the year, and a further Vote on Account for a large sum of money would have been necessary. But more than that, if that course had been adopted, it would not have been in the power of the Government to proceed with any legislation, because the months of October, November, and December would have been entirely taken up with the consideration by Parliament of the £20,000,000 of Supply remaining to be voted for the Services of the year. The House will see that the margin of time for voting this large sum of money would have been excessively narrow if the assembling of Parliament had been postponed to the month of October. There is another matter which has been made the subject of comment—that the Government, though the Queen's Speech only referred to the Estimates, have in their speeches on the Address considerably enlarged the scope of the debate. I admit that this is a charge which may be brought, whether fairly and reasonably or not I will not say, but if the Government have made an error they have made the error from a cause which almost invariably leads to error—namely, that they have desired to please everybody. We were told by some that it would be highly improper for us to state, with any amount of detail, our policy for Ireland; and again we were told by others that it would be highly improper if we did not state, with a considerable amount of detail, our decided policy for Ireland. Well, we tried to pursue a middle course. We laid before the House, as is usual on the formation of a new Government, the views we entertained on the question of the hour beyond which we could not at present go. Undoubtedly we might have limited ourselves to the actual scope of the Queen's Speech, and have refused to make any communication whatever as to our views on the question of Ireland; but I am bound to say that I think that course would have exposed us to formidable attacks and accusations which it would have been difficult to meet satisfactorily. Now, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork which he has put down on the Paper indicates that in his opinion the House ought to proceed immediately with legislation for Ireland, either by the Government or on the Motion of private Members in the absence of such action being taken by the Government. I really cannot at all agree with, nor do I think any very large section of hon. Gentlemen opposite will be disposed to agree with that contention. I cannot conceive any policy more likely to bring into contempt the Executive Government and the Imperial Parliament in Ireland than that it should be supposed in Ireland that the Executive Government and the Imperial Parliament are ready, at almost 24 hours' notice, to turn out any quantity of schemes of legislation as a panacea for all the difficulties and grievances of that country. It is more than possible that many of the difficulties with which we have now to contend arise from that principle having been too much neglected; and certainly I was of opinion that when I stated to the House that the Government would ask the House to discourage legislation on the part of private Members at this time of the year, that statement met with general acceptance and approval in the House. It must be obvious to the hon. Member for Cork that what I may call the physical impossibilities of inducing the House of Commons to address itself seriously to large schemes of legislation at this period of the year are insuperable; and I cannot but hope that the hon. Member for Cork on serious reflection will find that there is on that subject not much difference of opinion between himself and Her Majesty's Government, and will be content with raising a discussion on this Motion, which discussion, I admit, he is legitimately entitled to raise. We have pledged ourselves as a Government to produce at the meeting of Parliament next year such schemes of legislation as we may be able to decide upon and mature in the autumn and winter; but

I would seriously point out to the House that if the proceedings of this Session were to be greatly protracted, and if the energies of Members and Ministers were to be greatly exhausted by such protracted proceedings, it will obviously become almost impossible for the Government to fulfil that pledge—[*Opposition laughter, and* "Hear, hear!"]—we do not all possess the iron constitution of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere); few people do—and it will also become very difficult for the Government to summon Parliament as early next year. That is a matter which the House ought seriously to consider, not only in the interests of the Government—I ask no consideration on their behalf—but also in the interests of Parliament as a whole, and in the interests of the country. There is only one more consideration by which I support this Motion. This Motion is intended to wind up, with as much expedition as is reasonable and decent, the Business of the Session, and to allow Members to separate in reasonable time for the annual Recess. I would not, for a moment, wish the House to understand that I am advocating anything like a rapid or slovenly discussion of the Estimates. I have always protested against that, and always shall. I am not asking for anything but that the House will concentrate its attention on the Estimates, and proceed without unreasonable dilatoriness or loss of time. What I would submit to the House is this, and I submit it with all seriousness, that the difficulties which lie in the future before the Government are very great indeed. No one can be more deeply impressed with the magnitude of those difficulties than are my Colleagues and myself, and certainly I see no possibility of arriving at anything like a solution of those difficulties, unless the House and the country are prepared to give a reasonable amount of time during which the Government may take thought for a future so anxious and so grave. But I would also point out that, great as are the difficulties of the Government, the Opposition also are surrounded by great difficulties. It will not be easy for the Opposition, it must be a matter of immense consideration and deliberation for them to decide upon the line of action which may unite their forces, and may bring them into that path by which they may attain the object, and the honourable object, of all Oppositions—to place themselves in the position of governing the country. I imagine that they also will find great difficulty in arriving at a solution of that question, and certainly the element of time will not be against them. But, in the third place, I would add this, that, great as are the difficulties of the Government, considerable as are the difficulties of the Opposition, I think it is not impossible—I say this without wishing to give the slightest offence—that the difficulties of the hon. Member for Cork are great beyond all. Well, Sir, that being so, I submit that the main reason for this Motion is, that the Business of the House be conducted with reasonable expedition, and that all Parties who, in their own light, are animated by one object—namely, that of securing the welfare of the country—may take reasonable time to take stock of their position, and to realize, as far as they can, the prospects of the future. It may be that it will be impossible in the immediate future to avoid great and bitter controversies which may involve the fate of Ministries and the life of Parliament; but, at any rate, it is not imprudent, it is not impolitic, to suggest, before these controversies are finally entered upon, there should be a reasonable period for reflection and calculation, so that whatever the issue of the controversies may be, at any rate it may not be said that Parliament has been precipitate, or hurried, or rash in its conclusions. These are really the reasons—I will venture to call them reasons of high policy—which have induced the Government to make this large demand upon the Privileges of Parliament and the time of the House. It is not put forward in any controversial spirit, or with any desire to take any undue advantage of hon. Members, or to, in any way, hurry the voting of Supplies through the House. It is put forward solely and only in the interests of the House and the public, and because we believe that by this action we shall best secure the general convenience of Parliament at large, and the general safety and security of the interests which, for the time, we have committed to our charge.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the

Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said, he thought the Motion of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) at this time of the Session was an unprecedented proceeding, and ought not to be agreed to without great consideration on the part of hon. Members. The noble Lord had wandered back to 1841 in order to find a precedent—the only semblance of a precedent on the matter—but he did not go into the details of that precedent. On that occasion Parliament was dissolved early in August, and the Elections took place in September, and Parliament was called together on the 18th of September.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): On that occasion Parliament was dissolved on June 26. The Government resigned on August 30.

MR. DILLON said, that, however that might be, the noble Lord did not tell the House whether the Session of 1841 was practically a barren Session. Before he dealt with the character of the Motion he wished to say a few words in reference to the speech in which the noble Lord sought to enforce his views on the House. Not only was the attempted parallel between the two cases no parallel at all, but the noble Lord had misquoted the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The noble Lord represented the hon. Member for Cork as having said last night that there was no urgent Business before the House; but what he did say was that there was no legislation before the House, and that the Business for which it was now proposed to take the whole time of the House to the exclusion of all other possible Business was not urgent, since the Government had enough money to carry them on until the 31st of October. The noble Lord had said that the explanations which the Government had given of their Irish policy had been given owing to a desire on their part to try and please all Parties. There certainly had been no apparent desire of this character in anything which the Government had done. The Government had tried to justify the reason why it had not stated its policy in the Speech from the Throne by hinting that the declaration of policy was to be made in speeches in the House. Now that was contrary to the facts. It must have been evident to all that it was impossible for the Government to state their policy and continue to exist, and that the policy of the Government would not be made known unless on compulsion. One of the reasons which had led hon. Members on that side of the House to oppose this Motion arose out of those very explanations for which the noble Lord took credit. Then, considering the course of Business recommended by the Government, he recognized that under certain circumstances, such as the time of the year, the condition of the country and the like, there might be little to say against the Resolution of the noble Lord. But these were not such circumstances as those in which they now found themselves. The conditions of the present situation, so far at least as Ireland was concerned, were of such a character that it was necessary for the noble Lord in the fulfilment of his duty to prove urgency before he could ask the House to pass the Resolution. What was that Resolution? It was a demand for the whole time of the House for Business already provided for, and that Standing Order 21 should be rescinded, and the only reason given for this demand was that hon. Members were tired and wanted to get away for a holiday. The effect of the passing of the second clause would be, as a matter of fact, to prevent the bringing up of grievances before Supply, or the discussion of anything not strictly confined to the Resolution in question. Thus, there would be but one discussion on the Army, one on the Navy, and one on the Civil Service Estimates, and private Members would be deprived of Tuesdays, Wednesday, and Fridays, the days on which other discussions and grievances most important to the public would take place. He contended that there never had been an occasion on which the Irish Members ought to be more jealous in granting the Government money before the expression of their grievances. As to the time of year at which the present Parliament had been called, he could not treat that as an argument for the Resolution. Who was it that urged on the late Government that Parliament should meet at this season of the year? The last Government had wished to postpone the meeting of Parliament until October, but the present Government insisted that a pledge should be given that Parliament would be called together immediately after the Elections. The late Prime Minister the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had declared that no consideration would induce him to postpone the measures which he considered necessary for the difficulty in Ireland, and in answer to appeals from Irish Members and from Members of the present Government that it would be a dereliction of duty to postpone the Irish Question over next winter. The Conservative Party agreed that the Irish Question was urgent; but now that they were in Office they wanted to postpone it. It was said that a policy for Ireland could not be framed in 24 hours; but those who spoke in this tone reminded one of Rip Van Winkle, and must have forgotten that the Irish Question had been discussed *ad nauseam* for the past five years. However, though the month of August was not a pleasant one to be in London, yet why did the Government meet in it, for if they had honest intentions to deal with the Irish Question, they could have postponed the meeting of Parliament till October? The Irish Party took care to impress the House that the difficulty in Ireland could not bear to wait, yet in the face of those warnings the present Government decided at any cost—perhaps he might say at a fearful cost—to postpone the evil hour, to summon Parliament in August that Members might be desirous of escaping from London owing to the strain of the season, and thus achieve the postponement of the Irish difficulty to next spring. The noble Lord had made an important statement to-night. It was only now that it had leaked out that the Government intended to meet Parliament in the spring with Irish proposals; and why this determination? A very few nights ago the Government had hoped that the Commission of Inquiry would report at the end of next spring, and stated that the Report would then require immense deliberation and consideration before the Government could come to any definite decision. The Irish Party, from the necessity of their situation, were compelled to continue the discussion, in the hope that the Government would still further mend their hand—in the hope that the Government would give them a policy, perhaps an *ad interim* and temporary policy, which would bridge over the evils which would surely follow on the continuance of their present attitude. He again reminded the Government that the House had been in possession of full information for years, and that the late Prime Minister in attempting to frame that information into legislation had been repeatedly assailed by the present Government to produce his policy, even a few weeks being grudged him to formulate it. The Irish Party would press the Government for their policy for carrying on the Executive in Ireland during the coming winter. So far as that policy appeared it might be divided into two parts—the first consisting of Irish proposals to be introduced at the beginning of next Session, and the second proposals for tiding over the winter, and carrying on the administration. The Government had practically laid before the House no distinct proposals of remedy for dealing with the immediate emergency in Ireland except the sending of General Buller to Kerry, and the firm administration of the law, and this course was to be pursued in the face of the failure of past experience of the same character. The conditions when the last Government came in were more favourable to an easy rule in Ireland than they were now, and yet at Christmas they had been told that they were face to face with a Coercion Bill. Proposals of policy precisely like those of the Government were carried into effect, and the consequence was that the policy had utterly broken down. Common sense would tell anybody that the pursuit of the same course, under a worse environment, would only end in the same goal of coercion, and that of an aggravated kind. When the Government had entered upon the task of governing Ireland last year they had sent over a Governor who—whatever dispute there might be as to his political views—had undoubtedly ingratiated himself a great deal with the people, and had led them to believe that he had come there to initiate the true policy—a policy of conciliation and concession. Lord Carnarvon had made a most remarkable declaration, which had undoubtedly aroused the hatred and indignation of Irish landlords, and had encouraged the Irish people to hope and be peaceful. That declaration was a hint to the landlords to exercise their rights with prudence and restraint, and not to embarrass the Government. The consequence of this was that there was a most extraordinary falling off in the number of evictions in Ireland during last winter, a falling off averaging 50 per cent, which he could attribute to nothing but the declaration of Lord Carnarvon. But in the following quarter in 1886 the evictions rose to above their usual average, and this in consequence of a similar policy to that which the Government now intended to pursue—the policy of "no surrender," to use an Irish phrase of provocation—of the encouragement of the landlords, and the promise to them of the armed protection of the law in carrying out evictions. This would give the House the best reason to believe that the coming winter would be one of most dangerous disturbance in Ireland unless something different were done. The pursuance of the present policy would compel the Government, instead of meeting Parliament next spring with remedial measures, to revive coercion. The Irish Party had been accused of wasting time when they impressed on the Government arguments like these. They would, however, by persistent debate, continue still to try and induce the Government to hold out some hope of protection to the Irish tenants during the coming winter, and by so doing attempt their best to prevent baneful occurrences, and hinder the Government from treading the old fatal path—which, as surely as the sun rose, they were certain to tread—followed so fruitlessly in the past. Would that not be worth a week or a fortnight of debate? If the Irish Members were put down, he could only say that the House would find to the cost of its time and temper that it made a great mistake in allowing the heat of August to make them shut their ears and ignore common sense and reason. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) enjoyed justly Tory confidence, and even he had stated, on the 9th April last, that the agrarian difficulty was the cause of the recrudescence of crime in Ireland, and that at least that cause should be made forceless for a time, and that the "Truce of God" existing in Ireland might be continued by bringing in a Bill to suspend all eviction for six months, leaving the question of arrears to be settled in connection with any ultimate settlement of the Land Question; and that he would throw upon the Government the duty of lending to the landlords such amounts as might be necessary to keep them out of distress and destitution. It was an extraordinary thing that the right hon. Gentleman should not have stood by that statement of his. Nothing had happened since the 9th of April to lessen the force of that appeal or the strain of the situation; on the contrary, much had occurred to accentuate it; and if the right hon. Gentleman had been justified at that time in the proposal which he had made, he was now bound ten times more strongly to support such a measure. On the 9th of April the people of Ireland had had many causes for suffering in patience which were now taken away from them, and that had been towards the beginning of summer, which was a time when the smallest number of evictions always took place. The appeal which the noble Lord had now made to the House was, in his opinion, a delusive one. The noble Lord had appealed to them to allow hon. Members to go away from that House in order calmly to consider the situation in Ireland. The situation in Ireland could not be calmly considered. Instead of calmly considering a state of things which required present remedy, they would go to their homes, not quietly to ruminate, but to be inflamed with accounts of the results of Irish evictions to such an extent that coercion, not remedy, would be the only consideration. The "Truce of God" spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would be broken in Ireland, and the passions of the people would be so inflamed that they would not be in a temper to consider remedial measures. He maintained that the situation in Ireland would not wait; it would not allow them to consider it patiently. It required to be dealt with at present, and if it were not possible to deal with it permanently, it must be dealt with temporarily. Admittedly the winter in Ireland would be a dangerous one, and he strongly recommended the wished to postpone the meeting of Parliament until October, but the present Government insisted that a pledge should be given that Parliament would be called together immediately after the Elections. The late Prime Minister the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had declared that no consideration would induce him to postpone the measures which he considered necessary for the difficulty in Ireland, and in answer to appeals from Irish Members and from Members of the present Government that it would be a dereliction of duty to postpone the Irish Question over next winter. The Conservative Party agreed that the Irish Question was urgent; but now that they were in Office they wanted to postpone it. It was said that a policy for Ireland could not be framed in 24 hours; but those who spoke in this tone reminded one of Rip Van Winkle, and must have forgotten that the Irish Question had been discussed *ad nauseam* for the past five years. However, though the month of August was not a pleasant one to be in London, yet why did the Government meet in it, for if they had honest intentions to deal with the Irish Question, they could have postponed the meeting of Parliament till October? The Irish Party took care to impress the House that the difficulty in Ireland could not bear to wait, yet in the face of those warnings the present Government decided at any cost—perhaps he might say at a fearful cost—to postpone the evil hour, to summon Parliament in August that Members might be desirous of escaping from London owing to the strain of the season, and thus achieve the postponement of the Irish difficulty to next spring. The noble Lord had made an important statement to-night. It was only now that it had leaked out that the Government intended to meet Parliament in the spring with Irish proposals; and why this determination? A very few nights ago the Government had hoped that the Commission of Inquiry would report at the end of next spring, and stated that the Report would then require immense deliberation and consideration before the Government could come to any definite decision. The Irish Party, from the necessity of their situation, were compelled to continue the discussion, in the hope that the Government would still further mend their hand—in the hope that the Government would give them a policy, perhaps an *ad interim* and temporary policy, which would bridge over the evils which would surely follow on the continuance of their present attitude. He again reminded the Government that the House had been in possession of full information for years, and that the late Prime Minister in attempting to frame that information into legislation had been repeatedly assailed by the present Government to produce his policy, even a few weeks being grudged him to formulate it. The Irish Party would press the Government for their policy for carrying on the Executive in Ireland during the coming winter. So far as that policy appeared it might be divided into two parts—the first consisting of Irish proposals to be introduced at the beginning of next Session, and the second proposals for tiding over the winter, and carrying on the administration. The Government had practically laid before the House no distinct proposals of remedy for dealing with the immediate emergency in Ireland except the sending of General Buller to Kerry, and the firm administration of the law, and this course was to be pursued in the face of the failure of past experience of the same character. The conditions when the last Government came in were more favourable to an easy rule in Ireland than they were now, and yet at Christmas they had been told that they were face to face with a Coercion Bill. Proposals of policy precisely like those of the Government were carried into effect, and the consequence was that the policy had utterly broken down. Common sense would tell anybody that the pursuit of the same course, under a worse environment, would only end in the same goal of coercion, and that of an aggravated kind. When the Government had entered upon the task of governing Ireland last year they had sent over a Governor who—whatever dispute there might be as to his political views—had undoubtedly ingratiated himself a great deal with the people, and had led them to believe that he had come there to initiate the true policy—a policy of conciliation and concession. Lord Carnarvon had made a most remarkable declaration, which had undoubtedly aroused the hatred and indignation of Irish landlords, and had encouraged the Irish people to hope and be peaceful. That declaration was a hint to the landlords to exercise their rights with prudence and restraint, and not to embarrass the Government. The consequence of this was that there was a most extraordinary falling off in the number of evictions in Ireland during last winter, a falling off averaging 50 per cent, which he could attribute to nothing but the declaration of Lord Carnarvon. But in the following quarter in 1886 the evictions rose to above their usual average, and this in consequence of a similar policy to that which the Government now intended to pursue—the policy of "no surrender," to use an Irish phrase of provocation—of the encouragement of the landlords, and the promise to them of the armed protection of the law in carrying out evictions. This would give the House the best reason to believe that the coming winter would be one of most dangerous disturbance in Ireland unless something different were done. The pursuance of the present policy would compel the Government, instead of meeting Parliament next spring with remedial measures, to revive coercion. The Irish Party had been accused of wasting time when they impressed on the Government arguments like these. They would, however, by persistent debate, continue still to try and induce the Government to hold out some hope of protection to the Irish tenants during the coming winter, and by so doing attempt their best to prevent baneful occurrences, and hinder the Government from treading the old fatal path—which, as surely as the sun rose, they were certain to tread—followed so fruitlessly in the past. Would that not be worth a week or a fortnight of debate? If the Irish Members were put down, he could only say that the House would find to the cost of its time and temper that it made a great mistake in allowing the heat of August to make them shut their ears and ignore common sense and reason. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) enjoyed justly Tory confidence, and even he had stated, on the 9th April last, that the agrarian difficulty was the cause of the recrudescence of crime in Ireland, and that at least that cause should be made forceless for a time, and that the "Truce of God" existing in Ireland might be continued by bringing in a Bill to suspend all eviction for six months, leaving the question of arrears to be settled in connection with any ultimate settlement of the Land Question; and that he would throw upon the Government the duty of lending to the landlords such amounts as might be necessary to keep them out of distress and destitution. It was an extraordinary thing that the right hon. Gentleman should not have stood by that statement of his. Nothing had happened since the 9th of April to lessen the force of that appeal or the strain of the situation; on the contrary, much had occurred to accentuate it; and if the right hon. Gentleman had been justified at that time in the proposal which he had made, he was now bound ten times more strongly to support such a measure. On the 9th of April the people of Ireland had had many causes for suffering in patience which were now taken away from them, and that had been towards the beginning of summer, which was a time when the smallest number of evictions always took place. The appeal which the noble Lord had now made to the House was, in his opinion, a delusive one. The noble Lord had appealed to them to allow hon. Members to go away from that House in order calmly to consider the situation in Ireland. The situation in Ireland could not be calmly considered. Instead of calmly considering a state of things which required present remedy, they would go to their homes, not quietly to ruminate, but to be inflamed with accounts of the results of Irish evictions to such an extent that coercion, not remedy, would be the only consideration. The "Truce of God" spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would be broken in Ireland, and the passions of the people would be so inflamed that they would not be in a temper to consider remedial measures. He maintained that the situation in Ireland would not wait; it would not allow them to consider it patiently. It required to be dealt with at present, and if it were not possible to deal with it permanently, it must be dealt with temporarily. Admittedly the winter in Ireland would be a dangerous one, and he strongly recommended the

Government to show their earnestness by introducing even a temporary measure for six months. Before sitting down he wished to make a last appeal to the Government—that was that they would consider that the urgency of the case in Ireland was amply sufficient to justify the action he and those acting with him were taking. Further, that they would not give way to impatience—that they would not be deluded into the belief that they could brush aside Ireland and leave it until next spring. Besides, he assured the Government, by setting aside this question, they would be laying up for themselves, in the future, an enormous waste of public time and energy and of the temper of hon. Members of the House, compared with which any discussion just now was the merest child's play. He begged to move the Amendment to the Motion of the noble Lord of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House the state of Ireland is such as to require the proposal of remedial measures by the Government, before the time of the House is appropriated solely to the Business of Supply,"—(*Mr. Dillon,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Though I agree in a great deal which the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) has said, I do not find myself able to concur in the conclusions at which he has arrived. In all that he has said as to the grave condition of Ireland at this moment I cordially concur. That is the position which this side of the House has taken from the earliest moment of the present year. We urged upon the former Conservative Government the necessity of taking remedial measures for dealing with the matter at once. When the late Government came into power they recognized the necessity of dealing with the Irish Question at once. They felt, and my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) stated, that one of the chief grounds which induced him to propound the policy for which we are responsible was the impossibility of meeting the coming winter without doing something for the settlement of Ireland. We have always stated, and we now still believe, that it is an unwise and unsafe policy to leave matters in Ireland for the winter without a remedy and without doing anything. We have always believed that there is only one alternative—that is to say, to propose for Ireland at once a policy either of conciliation or a policy of coercion—that one of these two policies will be absolutely necessary, and that it is impossible to avoid them. That is what my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian has constantly stated in the course of the last few months. Therefore, there is no doubt we regard the responsibilities of the present Government as of the gravest character in undertaking to meet the coming winter in Ireland without doing anything at all—without propounding such measures for the maintenance of social order as may be necessary. But then the situation of the House is that the Government have the power and the responsibility, and we must consider what, with regard to the public interest, we can do in this matter. Having made our protest against the policy, in view of the coming winter in Ireland, of doing nothing on the part of the Government, we must lay upon them the whole responsibility of the consequences of their action. But I would ask the hon. Member for East Mayo what we can do in this matter, having regard to the responsibility which belongs to the Government—what course can we take? Suppose we reject the Motion of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) and adopt this Amendment we have no power to compel the Government to bring in remedial measures. The majority does not rest with us, and they have determined they will bring forward no measures with reference to Ireland this Session. The hon. Member for East Mayo and others had an opportunity on the Address of bringing forward their views with reference to the condition of Ireland and the dangers in Ireland, and of expressing their opinion as to the impolicy of the course the Government proposed to pursue. What more can they do, supposing the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were rejected? It is true in the ordinary course we might have at our disposal

Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; but the hon. Member for East Mayo must feel—I am sure we all feel—that in dealing with the question of Ireland it is hopeless to expect that we can deal with it by legislation of private Members. It is too large and grave a question to be disposed of in that manner. Nor can we hope to succeed by proceeding in that way. If the hon. Member for East Mayo, or any Member on this side, were to propound some measure opposed by a majority of this House, of course we should have no chance of passing it. The hon. Member might show the necessity and the gravity of the situation; but we have had an opportunity of doing that, and I would point out to the hon. Member that all future opportunities are not gone, because upon the various stages of the Appropriation Bill, before the final control of the money goes out of the hands of the House of Commons, for the purpose of bringing forward the consideration of a question of policy of that kind, the opportunity is given according to the Constitutional practice of the House. I do not see really what we can do to forward the object of the hon. Member, with which to a great extent I sympathize. If I thought we had any resource left of urging upon the Government more strongly than we have hitherto urged the danger of the delay they propose, and the extreme necessity and expediency of, in some form or other, bringing forward measures, there might be some reason for the Amendment. We can hardly ask them to bring forward the measures which they have suggested, because they are measures of which we do not approve. If I saw any way of pressing upon them, with any prospect of success, the expediency of dealing with the great dangers in Ireland, I would support the Amendment of the hon. Member; but I confess I do not see that we should succeed or have any better prospect of success than that which has been already afforded to us upon the Address, or that we may have again, if necessary, upon the Appropriation Bill. I do not see that any Motion to give private Members Wednesdays and Fridays would do any good. The hon. Member has spoken in a manner which is highly deserving of the attention of the House, and his words are deeply deserving the attention and consideration of the Government. But the Government are resolved to do nothing for Ireland till next February, and we are without the power to induce them to do so. Therefore, looking at all the circumstances of the case, to the necessities of the Public Service, and to the time—even if we had the disposal of the time from this until October we could not do anything in the face of the attitude of the Government—I do not myself see what can be gained even from the point of view of the hon. Member for East Mayo by the Amendment, and, as far as I am concerned, I shall support the Motion of the noble Lord.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, E.) said, he would be one of the greatest sufferers were the Motion of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) adopted, because of the place he held on the Paper—the first place on Wednesday—for an extremely important Bill, not exclusively an Irish Bill, but one affecting the community in general—he referred to the Amendment of the Employers' Liabilities Act. Any such Bill as that ought to receive a fair discussion, and he did not think any of the arguments brought forward by the noble Lord met the case. Were workmen to be shut out from compensation for six months or 12 months because certain hon. Members were anxious for a little relaxation? Hon. Members had not been very long there. They had only been in attendance about three weeks, and he thought they might be able to do something for the good of Ireland and the working classes. They had all had a good deal of relaxation recently—they had all had the excitement of a General Election; and if the noble Lord did not think he would be the better for doing some work which was urgent, he ought surely not to be indisposed to allow private Members to do it. The noble Lord asked the House to deprive Members of the privilege and opportunity of introducing measures, and he thought they could not consent to any such infringement of their rights. He did not quite follow the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), that they could not force the Government to undertake remedial measures. The Government might not always have a majority in the House. Private Bills might be brought forward or Resolutions which the Liberal Unionists might feel bound to support. He did not think the Unionist Liberals always would support the Government to prevent radical measures or remedial measures for Ireland being carried. The noble Lord wished to limit their opportunities for bringing those test questions forward, and to that they could not consent. The noble Lord had proposed Commissioners. He did not think these Commissioners were bad in themselves; but what were they going to do for the next five or six months? What did the noble Lord think the people were to think and to do in the interval? If he were to do now even a little, a small portion of what was to be proposed in the grand scheme of the Commissioners—if he would only spend a little of the money now that he intended to do, and bring in a Bill for that purpose, he thought he would not be disappointed. That was quite *apropos* of the question now being discussed. To a certain extent, the hon. Members of the Government side were muzzled by their position, although he must confess that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) did not look as if he were muzzled. They, however, who sat upon the Opposition side were free, and why should they not be allowed to bring forward their different Bills, a course of action which ought, to a great extent, relieve the great responsibility of the noble Lord, and it would be for the Government to accept or to reject them?

Mr. J. STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said, he did not rise to obstruct the Business of the House, but to do what was the duty of every hon. Member—namely, to state the reason why he should vote for the Amendment, and why he trusted that every hon. Member who belonged to the same Party as himself would support it. He was sorry that right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench did not see their way to vote for the Amendment; but he took no exception to the line of argument adopted by the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), whose conduct on the question of Ireland was daily commanding the increasing respect of that portion of the House in which he sat. His own reason for voting for the Amendment was a very simple one. He did not desire to urge upon the Government to bring forward any complete scheme relating to Ireland; but he saw a winter approaching full of promise of trouble, and he desired to obtain from the Government some form of expression of sympathy with those persons who were tenants, and who would suffer the most through the unfortunate troubles. Troubles were ahead in Ireland, and would be imminent when the Coercion Bill which he believed would shortly be proposed from the other side was brought in. It would be at least a comfort to him (Mr. Stuart) to recollect that he freed his conscience by joining with the Irish Members in warning the Government of the danger ahead.

Mr. A. L. BROWN (Hawick, &c.) said, Scotch Members, and even Scotch Radicals, were not always found siding with the Irish Nationalists, and he hoped hon. Members would pardon him if he asked a few minutes' indulgence while he endeavoured to explain what appeared to many the extraordinary phenomenon of the hon. Member for the Border Burghs supporting the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). Now, he was glad to intervene, even at this late stage, for this reason—that he saw Liberal Unionists and Unionist newspapers making the charge that the so-called Gladstonian Liberals were becoming ashamed of these Motions. He came quite frequently in contact with Gladstonian Liberals, and he never heard such an extraordinary opinion. Horace said that men easily believed what they wanted to believe; but the only opinion he heard expressed just now by those called Gladstonian Liberals was that the Scotch and the Welsh Radicals would firmly adhere to the Irish Nationalists in the present struggle, and endeavour to keep up the good spirit which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had awakened within the Irish breast. The Amendment spoke of the urgency of measures for ameliorating the condition of the Irish people. It was on account of that urgency that he was in the British House of Commons. The people of the Border Burghs would never have quarrelled with such a dear political friend (Sir George Trevelyan) as they had had it not been that the condition of the Irish Question was so very urgent. When the Election came round and the candidates presented themselves the people asked the question—"Are you willing to give to the Irish people measures that will ameliorate their condition? Do you recognize, and will you rise to, the urgency of the question, and will you give them an Irish Parliament for the management of purely Irish affairs, because, if you do not, we must get servants who will execute our desires?" This policy of urgency his constituency in the Border Burghs considered so urgent that it caused them to make the great sacrifice to which he had referred—namely, of parting with Sir George Trevelyan. Now, however—when he came there—he found that this policy of urgency was met by what was called a policy of great deliberation, a policy which was presented to them as if it was something new, but which, after all, was a policy with which his constituents and himself were perfectly familiar. With reference to the words in the Address, "measures for ameliorating the condition of the Irish people," he might say that he did not propose to say a single word in regard to any political measure—in regard, that was to say, to Home Rule, though he dared say even that might very well come under the head of urgency. They had been promising and giving the Irish people political measures for the last 86 years, and for 86 years the condition of Ireland had gone steadily back. [*Cries of* "No!"] He would be glad to be corrected; but such was his reading of Irish history. He would not, however, say a single word on that question. The people of this country thought very strongly in politics, and he thought that the claim put forward by the Government for time to consider the remedy for laws which they admitted were bad and required reform —[*Cries of* "No!"] Well, he had seen many reports of speeches by Conservative Members, in which it was admitted that something very considerable must be done in the way of reform. He admitted that the claim on the part of the Government for time, so far as the reform of the laws was concerned, was a reasonable claim, and one he did not think the hon. Member for Cork or his followers were inclined to find fault with or dispute. If they had to wait for six, nine, 18, or 24 months until they had a Parliament in College Green, and got it at that time, they might be very well content. But there were some things—not political institutions—which the people of Ireland could not wait for so easily. When the poorest class of people were suffering from cold and hunger it was not so easy to ask them to wait. There were two claims of urgency before the House. One was the claim of the Government that they should have time to consider a Home Rule measure, or a measure of Irish government reform. And the Opposition asked, would the Government in the interval between the present time and the period when they intended to reform laws they admitted to be bad—would the Government give a guarantee in the meantime that these bad laws would not be used to oppress and tyrannize over the poor people of Ireland? Each Party had its clients, and each of them was entitled to state its clients' case. The Government had to plead for the landlords, who, he quite admitted, had not been getting their rents paid as they ought to do; but, on the other hand, they on the Opposition Benches had to plead for the poor people of Ireland, and they were equally entitled with the Government to be listened to. Reference had been made to a speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) in which he suggested a suspension of evictions. He read the speech of the right hon. Member in which he suggested the suspension of evictions, and the view he (Mr. A. L. Brown) then took of it was, that the right hon. Gentleman was a man with a heart. He (Mr. A. L. Brown) took the same view of the matter; and he could not understand how any man with a heart, having once proposed the Suspension of Evictions Bill, could ever recede from that position. He could understand a great statesman saying political situations could wait; but he could not understand a man who admitted that the condition of the people was so bad as to necessitate a Suspension of Evictions Bill throwing up that proposal. He remembered that when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham came to Scotland he won the hearts of the working men by his proposal to relieve the people of school rates, and to give the crofters not only their pastoral but also their arable land. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman why it was that he was rapidly losing the hearts of the working men? It was because that when the Irish tenants called upon him "for mercy's sake to stay and stick to his proposal to suspend evictions," he turned round and said—"No, the claims of Party will not allow me to do so." He appealed to the Liberal Unionists to reconsider this matter. A very grave responsibility rested on them. They had been boasting how the power really lay in their hands. A very serious state of facts had been brought forward——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is not speaking to the Question of Precedence, which is sought to be given by the Resolution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. A. L. BROWN said, he was very sorry for having transgressed, but he would try to speak to the question of urgency. He appealed to the Government and to the Liberal Unionists, who claimed to hold the position of arbiters, not to turn a deaf ear to the cries and entreaties of the Irish people—who asked that something should be done for them before the winter—and warned them of the grave responsibility which rested upon them if they failed to realize their duty.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) said, he objected to the Motion of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) because it trenched very dangerously upon the independence of the Privileges of Parliament. It would establish a precedent of a very sinister character. The noble Lord referred to the precedent of 1841. He submitted that the precedent quoted was one that would not bear the noble Lord out at all. In the year 1841, the Government of Lord Melbourne were defeated on the question of finance, at a time when the whole Kingdom was in a great state of distress, as Ireland now was. The question of the Corn Laws was being debated, and whatever Government were in power were under the necessity of dealing with that matter, as any Government now was under the necessity of dealing with the Irish Question. The noble Lord said Sir Robert Peel adopted the same plan; but Sir Robert Peel did nothing of the kind. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had quoted as much as suited his purpose, and had left out what told on the other side. On the 16th of September, when the Parliament met, Sir Robert Peel proposed to defer a statement of the intentions of the Government with regard to re-establishing the equilibrium between Income and Expenditure until the following year, and also to defer other matters; but, so far from obtaining the assent of his opponents to that proposal, he was opposed by Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston. So strong was the feeling of some hon. Members that the attitude of the Government was unjustifiable, that Mr. Fielden moved that no Supply be granted until after inquiry into the cause of the then existing distress. That was negatived by the obedient majority of the Government; but the debate and the division showed that the unusual precedent was not allowed to pass without Constitutional challenge. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) demurred altogether to the proposal—from a Constitutional point of view—to the establishment of such a precedent as the noble Lord proposed. He denied that the voting of Supplies was the only function of the House. The Houses of Parliament had, as their principal functions, to decide upon and formulate the legislation of the country, to inquire into grievances, and to reform the laws—functions quite as important as the supply of the necessary means of carrying on the administration of the Sovereign. [On this point the hon. Gentleman quoted from recognized Constitutional authorities in support of his contention]. The hon. Member proceeding, said, that the course Government proposed to adopt was in flagrant violence to the spirit of all Constitutional procedure, and it was likely to establish what might hereafter prove a very dangerous precedent, and it ought not to be allowed to pass without some protest at the hands of private Members. With regard to the Amendment, and the urgency of the situation in Ireland, it appeared to him to be a great pity that this House should, in the circumstances, be asked to limit its activity to the voting of Supplies for the Crown, without taking any measure for the relief of distress, the removal of abuse, or the reform of laws, whether in the shape of a Bill introduced by the Government or by a private Member.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.) said, he hoped that the House might now be willing to permit the debate to close. The hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) had raised what, in his (Mr. A. O'Connor's) mind, was a very grave Constitutional question. But the point really at issue appeared to be a very narrow one. It was not contended that it would be agreeable to the House, or advantageous to the Public Service of the country, that they should proceed with ordinary legislation at the present time. The only whisper to the contrary was in the case of the hon. Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan), who had a little Bill of his own, for which he had a natural affection as for his own child. Considering the labours they had gone through during the past two years, both in and out of the House, they must all feel that a Recess of the ordinary duration was necessary to enable the House to prosecute to the best advantage the Business they had been elected to do. To proceed with such measures as had been placed on the Notice Paper by private Members, making changes of more or less importance in our laws, or to discuss changes of graver Constitutional importance, would be a thing they ought not to be asked to do, because their performance of it could in no respect be satisfactory to the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had told them that their choice with regard to Irish affairs was between a policy of conciliation and a policy of coercion; and, as he (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had gathered from the right hon. Gentleman, he considered the policy of the Government was a policy of do nothing. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT was understood to express dissent.] He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) thought the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that they had no such choice as that. What the right hon. Gentleman called a policy of conciliation was a policy of Constitutional change of the gravest importance, such as he and his Colleagues proposed in the last Parliament. Against that the present Government were pledged as strongly as any Government could be. Neither now nor in February were they at all likely to meet the views of the right hon. Gentleman on this subject. The right hon. Gentleman's other alternative was a policy of coercion. Did he want the Government to bring in a Coercion Bill at once for Ireland? It might be difficult for hon. Gentlemen to believe, but it was none the less true, that the Government were not naturally fond of what was called coercion for Ireland. They would infinitely prefer to maintain order in Ireland through the process of the ordinary law. They were endeavouring to do that now, and they had explained to the House the means by which they proposed to operate. But they had not concealed from the House that if those means should prove insufficient, they might be compelled to have recourse to Parliament for greater powers of the nature which the right hon. Gentleman described. The complaint from hon. Members below the Gangway, including the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), appeared to be that the Government did not at once apply to Parliament to revive powers of this nature.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said, the complaint was that they did not apply to Parliament for some Bill which would obviate the necessity hereafter to apply for further powers for coercion.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that was a third alternative; but it had not been put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby) said, he had not meant to confine the Government to the conciliation involved in the proposals of the late Government. He had referred to a general measure of conciliation.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, it was a little difficult to understand what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby did mean. He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) quite admitted that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his Colleagues, from their point of view, were entitled to blame the Government for not adopting the policy which was in the mind of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon); but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby had no right to make such a charge against them because he had found himself unable to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. The hon. Member for Cork and his Friends below the Gangway were of opinion that, owing to the fall in prices, the tenant farmers in Ireland could not pay even the judicial rents; and what they wished the House to pass was a Bill practically suspending evictions. That narrow point was really the issue between them. The hon. Member for Cork and his Friends asked for no other legislation now. He himself (Mr. Parnell) had said that he did not expect or desire a general revision of the Land Act at this time of the year. All he wished was a measure suspending evictions. He had urged the proposal with all the power of which he was possessed, and was supported by hon. Members around him, and by some who sat opposite, but not by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby. The Government had given the House their reasons for not adopting the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork, and, after full discussion, the matter had been decided against the hon. Gentleman; and yet the refusal to give the Government the time it asked for was based solely on the desire to raise this question again. It was not the fact that hon. Members would not have ample opportunities in the course of the discussion of the Votes in Supply, as well as at different stages of the Appropriation Bill, of bringing forward any matters in which they might take an interest. The Government did not, as his noble Friend (Lord Randolph Churchill) said, shrink from a full and ample discussion of those Votes. But what they did say was that they were, early in September, at a period of the year when it was extremely irksome to the great majority of hon. Members to be compelled to proceed with other than the necessary Business. They had had arduous work during the past few months, and they were entitled to a holiday. The Government asked the House to do that which was necessary for the completion of the ordinary Business of the year, and nothing else. They did not agree with the hon. Member for Cork that there was urgent need for that legislation affecting the question of Irish land which he desired. They deemed that there was reason for inquiry into that matter. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh, but that was their policy. They admitted that there was reason for inquiry, and that inquiry they would undertake at once. They had every reason to anticipate that when next Session came they should be prepared with proposals on that important subject. But if the Government were to do any good with the policy which had been fully placed before the House by his noble Friend, they must have that time to consider their proposals to which every Government was entitled. It was not possible for the Government to go further than they had done at the present time in making proposals for legislation. When the time for doing so came he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby would find that his taunt of a do-nothing policy was — in the circumstances—a very unfair description.. For the present the first duty of the Government was to take steps for the proper administration of the affairs of Ireland. They had no more desire—as he had repeatedly stated to the House—than hon. Members opposite that there should be any harshness exercised by landlords towards tenants who were unable to pay their rent; but if tenants are able to pay their rent they ought to be made to do so, and the law of the land ought to be enforced in support of the maintenance of legal obligations. As to the future, the Government had announced their policy. By that policy they should abide. They asked the House now to transact the necessary Business for the year with as great expedition as possible, in order that hon. Members might be relieved from a very irksome duty, and in order that the Government might be able to turn their attention to measures which they hoped would prove of real advantage to Ireland.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): I wish to explain, as the reason why I was not in my place to move the Amendment which stands in my name, that I was under the impression that the discussion upon the hon. Member for Northampton's (Mr. Labouchere's) Motion on the Report of the Address would have been resumed as the first Order. If I had understood that the Motion of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) was to have been brought forward thus early, I should certainly have been in my place to move the Amendment which I have given Notice of in opposition to the Motion of the noble Lord. It certainly was from no discourtesy to the noble Lord or to the House that I was absent. With reference to the Amendment which my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo has moved, I am glad he had the opportunity of moving an Amendment giving effect to the same view as I put forward, and of making a speech in support of it. I propose to make some observations with regard to the Amendment of my hon. Friend, and also with regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). I have also a word or two to say with regard to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). I wish to say that I do not find fault with the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has taken upon this matter. I think it is reasonable that an English Member in his position should perhaps think it better, in all the circumstances of the case, to support the original urgency Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but we Irish Members are in a very different position. My experience in this House has been, in reference to any gains that we have made, any victories which we have carried, that nothing is got except by constant persistence. The motto of "Try, try, try again" is the best one for the Irish Members to adopt. It has been successful in the case of every movement that we have made during the last 11 years in this House. I can run over very many matters, from the question of the abolition of flogging in the Army to the question of Irish autonomy, in which we have been engaged, and which has been simply brought to the front by a constant persistence, and by an exhibition of a belief, I hope, on our part, in the honesty and justice of the claims we made in this House. As regarded the charge of Obstruction, I think present circumstances showed it to be an absurdity, because I have shown last night that there was really no Business to obstruct. If I had desired to obstruct Public Business or the Government, I should certainly not waste powder and shot on this Session, but would keep it for next Session, when the Government would have brought forward their legislative measures. Of course, we are in this position, and we see that, in the present state of affairs, there is an analogy with that which presented itself at the close of the Session of 1880, when we had brought forward in the beginning of the Session a small Bill which was the foundation of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. We brought forward that Bill as private Members on a Wednesday, and one of the propositions which the present Government make in this Resolution is to take away the Wednesdays from private Members, so that we may not have the opportunity of doing what we did then. The Government of the day, as the result of the debate on that Bill, promised to introduce a measure of their own. That measure was subsequently introduced in the form of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, which was carried through all its stages by considerable majorities, and subsequently thrown out by the House of Lords. The present situation is analogous. You have in Ireland a state of affairs more intensified in their probable evil effects than existed even in 1880; consequently the necessity is all the more imperative on our part to urge on the Government the adoption of remedial legislation, and if they refuse to produce anything themselves, that we should produce something on our own account. In the debate on the Address I urged on the Government that they should bring forward a measure in reference to the Irish Land Question. The Government have refused to bring forward such a measure; I now propose to bring forward such a measure myself. I am at present engaged, with the help of some of my hon. Friends, in drafting the measure, and one of my objects in placing the Amendment to the Resolution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Paper was to save, at all events, one Wednesday from the grasp of the Government for the discussion of that Bill. What I propose will be this. I do not know whether I shall be in Order in sketching the outline of the proposed measure that I submitted to the Government. I have described it in the debate on the Address. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland is mistaken in supposing that in the debate on the Address I only recommended a measure for the suspension of evictions. I have not recommended the suspension of evictions absolutely. I have recommended, in the first place, that power should be given to Irish leaseholders to apply to the Courts to fix a judicial rent. That is a proposal which has been made by two hon. Gentlemen, one a Liberal Unionist and the other a Conservative. Secondly, I recommended that power should be given to the tenants who had their rents fixed prior to a year or two ago to apply to the Courts for a revision on the basis of prices. Thirdly, I recommended that power should be given—as it is given in the Land Act—to the Courts to suspend proceedings in ejectments—not to suspend evictions—on payment, say, of three-fourths of the old or original rent. What I wish to ask the Government is this, and I think that the question is a fair one. It is true, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has said, that hon. Members are here at present at considerable inconvenience. No doubt that is so. The heat of the weather recently has been very great, and hon. Members undoubtedly would very much desire to have a few weeks' holiday and a short respite from their Parliamentary labours. I myself would like it very much, and I sympathize with these feelings very strongly; but, at the same time, I think it is a low ground for the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to base his case upon. I am sure that hon. Members on both sides of the House, if they really thought they could save suffering, starvation, or crime in Ireland by remaining a week, a fortnight, or even a month longer at this period at their work, would not hesitate to make the sacrifice. Recollect that the House at its adjournment will be absent from legislative duties for five months. Five months is a long period to look forward to. A shorter period than that constituted the critical period in 1880. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that the proposals of the Government with regard to Ireland and the Land Question will be ready next February. But what we fear is this—that the passions and irritation of hon. Members of this House, and of the people of England, will have risen so much in the meantime that when that period arrives they will only have a mind for the consideration of one question, and that will be coercion. For myself, I will not allow those golden moments to be lost—moments which may never come again. The Irish Members have no control, neither have the Government control, over the events in Ireland in the coming winter. The right hon. Gentleman need not suppose, by my allusion to the events of 1880, that I am going to head any such agitation as then took place. I do not believe there will be such an agitation; but I believe that the situation of the tenantry of Ireland will be so desperate, so much more terrible, desperate, and critical than it was in those days, that there will be spontaneous movements among them which neither the Irish Members, nor the Government, nor anyone else will be able to control, and which will excite irritation, passion, and indignation in this country against the Irish people, so that politicians and statesmen will lose their balance. What I ask is that the Government should not shut the last door against the last consideration of this question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has spoken of the Report stage on the Appropriation Bill, and other stages of the Appropriation Bill, as offering us an opportunity for debate. The stages of the Appropriation Bill will come, I believe, at the end of this Session. I have only to say that that would be too late for our purpose. The time will then have gone by to make any effectual protest. Now is the time for us to try and make any effectual protest we may desire to make. Now is the time for us to state what we think is right and desirable, and to urge our proposals. If the Government will tack to the Resolution—it need not be done by a formal Amendment, a promise will be quite sufficient—an undertaking to afford us sufficient time to allow the definitive judgment of the House of Commons to be taken upon a measure the outlines of which I have not sketched, although I have suggested its nature, in that case I shall be glad to ask my hon. Friend the Member for Mayo, who moved this Amendment, to withdraw it. I believe that, when the House sees the moderate nature and character of the Bill, the measure will be supported by both sides, and the Government will probably think better of their proposal to allow this long weary interval of five months to elapse, and to permit a chasm to be thrown between the two countries which it might not be possible for us to fill.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I think I should not be paying due respect to the House if I did not offer some words in reply to the observations which have fallen from the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). I must premise my observations by saying that I altogether dispute the analogy which he has thought fit to draw between the conditions of Ireland in 1880 and those of the present time. The conditions of 1880 were these—that over a very large part of Ireland famine raged; there had been a total failure of crops; and there was great distress, verging on starvation, among many families who, indeed, were only kept from starvation by grants from the State and by the efforts of private charities. [MR. PARNELL: Not at the end of 1880.] No doubt, the country was recovering from the failure of the potato of 1878 and 1879; but there was immense distress in the country in 1880, and I know that the operations of the Relief Fund started under Viceregal auspices were continued well into 1881. Therefore, I cannot agree with the analogy of the hon. Member for Cork. What I have to say, however, on the part of the Government is, that it always has been, and always will be, so far as I and my Colleagues are concerned, our anxious desire in the arrangement of the Business of Parliament to meet, to the utmost possible extent, the general convenience of the House at large, and to recognize the position of great responsibility occupied by certain persons in opposition to the Government. We recognize that the responsibility of the hon. Member for Cork is, undoubtedly, very great, as great, perhaps, as that of any individual in the House; and I will admit that it is, perhaps, not altogether unreasonable, if the hon. Member for Cork, acting under that great sense of responsibility, and supported by his followers and others in this House, considers it to be his duty, and believes that it can possibly lead to any useful result, to place in detail before the House his views on the Land Question in the form of a Bill—his views of what is necessary to be done in regard to the Land Question in Ireland immediately, that we should admit that those views are undoubtedly worthy of the consideration of the House and of the Government. But this must be clearly understood—that the Government have already deliberately made their announcement to the House in regard to their views on the present state of the Land Question in Ireland; and however much those views may have been misrepresented, and however much they may have been misrepresented and perverted for Party purposes, we stand by them, and we shall neither add to them nor take from them, and we shall not recede from them or alter them in any way as far as the presion Session is concerned. But if the hon. Member for Cork desires for the sake of his own Party, and for the interests of his country generally, to make a fuller and more detailed statement of the manner in which he would deal with the Land Question of Ireland, the Government, without holding out the smallest or slightest expectation that they can in the smallest or slightest degree approach to any kind of agreement with the hon. Member for Cork, would not feel justified in withholding from him the opportunity which he seeks. I will certainly undertake to grant that opportunity on behalf of the Government, expressing, at the same time, a very earnest hope that our action may not be misrepresented and perverted as our former statements have been. I can only say that if the hon. Member for Cork desires, before the Session closes, at a moment when it may be most convenient to himself and to the House, and when his proposals are prepared, that a special Sitting of the House should be set apart for the exposition and discussion of his proposals, the Government would be prepared to meet him to that extent. But in that case the Government would make an appeal to the hon. Member and his Friends, and to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt), whose support this evening I am very glad to acknowledge, that this action on the part of the Government should be met in a corresponding spirit, and that hon. Members opposite should not take undue advantage of the great facilities for protracting Business which, undoubtedly, Supply affords; but that, so far as Party responsibility and Party action will admit, they should, on all non-controversial matters of Supply, co-operate with the Government to bring them to an early and a reasonable conclusion. I have, myself, no other desire, except that, as far as possible, we should act in harmony in this House, and I am willing to undergo a certain amount of risk and of misunderstanding in order to attain that most desirable end.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I believe I shall be expressing the unanimous opinion of those who sit on this side of the House in saying that we notice in the remarks of the noble Lord a spirit with which we entirely sympathize, and which we must regard, and do regard, as extremely re-assuring in a rather serious emergency. The proposal of the hon. Member for Cork was made with such a sense of the gravity of the situation, and in terms so moderate and persuasive, that in all parts of the House I am sure it must have been felt in the highest degree desirable to meet, if possible, the hon. Member's views. The noble Lord has perceived the justice of the hon. Member's position. I think that we all thoroughly understand what the noble Lord has impressed upon us—namely, that in professing his willingness to accede to the proposal of the hon. Member he makes clear the nature of his position, and impresses upon us that he commits himself, his Colleagues, and his followers to no assent whatever, necessarily, to any propositions which the hon. Member may think fit to make. I should say that, whatever the fate of the hon. Member's Bill may be, the fact of such a Bill having been produced on the responsibility of an hon. Member in his position, supported by his followers and others in various parts of the House, and of its having been discussed from various points of view, will in itself be an operation that should conduce to the success of those deliberations which the Government are about to undertake in the autumn. I say this without prejudice to the hope that the Bill may be of such a kind—in view of the emergency that I have always believed with the hon. Member for Cork since the Session began existed in Ireland, and which may possibly be aggravated in the coming months—as may on its merits possibly secure for it a larger degree of assent from the Government than, at present, the noble Lord thinks likely. But of that I will say no more. I only desire to express the sincere satisfaction with which we have the announcement of the noble Lord; and I think we may express our intention, as far as we can, of furthering by every possible means the progress of Public Business.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that, in view of the statement which the noble Lord had just made, he begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put.

Ordered, That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed.

Ordered, That the Standing Order, No. 21, relating to Notices on going into Committee of Supply on Monday and Thursday be extended to the other days of the week.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

REPORT. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question, "That the Address be read a second time."

Question put.

Address read a second time.

PUBLIC SPEECHES—SPEECHES OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER AT BELFAST.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton), in rising to move an Amendment, said, he claimed his right on the ground of precedence, as well as of convenience, to move it in the form he was about to do, and he was justified in taking that course, for notwithstanding the direct manner in which, during the debate on the Address, the Belfast speeches of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been assailed, among others, by his right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); speaking, notin his private capacity, but as the accredited Representative of the Liberal Party, the noble Lord had thought it consistent with his position, as Leader of the House, to treat all the appeals that had been made to him respecting the language he had used in Belfast with contemptuous silence. In such a case silence was more obstructive than any number of speeches, and, as the result, the Report stage of the Address was not taken last night; and it had become the duty of some Member, if not of every one, on that side of the House to put down an Amendment in order to find out what was the position the noble Lord himself occupied with regard to language used in Ireland. ["Oh, oh!"] What were the circumstances in which that language was used? A Bill was before the House of Commons for the better government of Ireland. Liberals believed that the Bill offered peace, and would give contentment to the people of Ireland; the Conservatives that, if it passed, it would lead to civil war. The Orangemen were fit instruments for the Conservatives in Ireland, and they had always been so in their excessive bigotry and intolerance, and in this particular case they were ready instruments, because the ascendancy which they had so long held in Ireland was threatened. The noble Lord went over to Ireland, and he landed at Larne. When he landed he was received almost in state. A large number of Orangemen marched past the hotel, and the noble Lord was the hero of the grand demonstration after the manner peculiar to the brethren. Amongst the lodges of Orangemen present were the Belfast Invincibles, and the Duke of Abercorn's Invincibles. Amongst the gentlemen who went over with the noble Lord was the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), and he explained to the brethren why the noble Lord had come. Then the noble Lord made a speech, in which he said that they enjoyed great privileges in the North of Ireland which were worth demonstrating for, and were worth fighting for. At the evening meeting he said he was anxious to ascertain how they proposed to deal with the crisis, what resources they could reckon upon, and what resistance they could give. The statements, he said, made in the Imperial Parliament of the numbers and determination of the Orange Party had been received by the Radicals and Parnellites with jeers and derision, and Mr. Gladstone believed that the Orange Party was played out. Then the noble Lord asked, amid great enthusiasm, whether his audience were the same men as their forefathers were in 1798. Everyone knew what their forefathers were then. According to Mr. Grattan, they were the most disreputable and oppressive banditti that ever existed on the face of the earth. In another speech the noble Lord said that if it should turn out that the Parliament of the United Kingdom was so recreant to its high duties, and the British nation was so besotted as to place them under the domination of an Assembly in Dublin, which must of necessity be a foreign and alien Assembly, he did not hesitate to tell them that in that dark hour there would not be wanting to them those of position and influence in England, who would be willing to cast in their lot and share their fortunes and their fate. On February 22 the noble Lord delivered a speech, a report of which he would quote from *The Belfast News Letter*. The noble Lord asked what title the Nationalists had to represent the Irish people, and said—

> "Is it by a long sequence of acts, or by any acts done on their behalf? Is it a title earned, by hard fighting in any action upon the fields That was the title of the Italians, the Greek- and the Bulgarians, to independence; that was the title by which the mountaineers of Montenegro freed themselves from Turkey."

The noble Lord proceeded to say that Mr. Parnell's title to independence was founded only on Parliamentary "action." He (Mr. Labouchere) could not imagine any Minister of State deliberately justifying such a sneer at a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects. The noble Lord sneered at them because they did not break out in open resistance. With absolutely cynical wickedness the noble Lord went to Ireland to proclaim the doctrine and urge the people of Belfast to break out in rebellion if the Home Rule Bill were passed, and then he returned to this country, and he and his Friends stated in the House, and during the Elections, that if the Bill were passed the people would break out in rebellion. Now, what was the meaning of that? It was that the noble Lord wanted a majority from the electors of this country; and so it was that he preached that the Bill, so far from bringing peace, would lead to civil war, with all its horrors. Therefore, the noble Lord first created his argument—and a most iniquitous argument it was—and then he used it for the purposes of himself and his Party. When people played with religious bigotry they played with edged tools, and it was so in this case. Shortly afterwards those persons in Belfast, whose religious animosities and passions had been fanned by the noble Lord, broke out in open riot, the result being that property was destroyed and blood was shed. He did not think anyone doubted, at present, that these riots were begun by the Orangemen. ["Oh, oh!"] No doubt, after a time, the Catholics joined in them; but Catholics were not frogs, and would not allow themselves to be stoned by their Protestant neighbours. These riots would not have taken place, in all probability, had not their passions been inflamed by the noble Lord; and, therefore, the noble Lord was responsible for every person killed and wounded, and all property destroyed, in Belfast; but the evil did not stop there, for what was worse, his statements had confined the Tory Party to the pledge that the Irish hopes of Home Rule should be blasted. The position in Ireland at the present time was most critical. The cup of what the Irish people considered liberty had been dashed from their lips. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had told them that they had an absolute right to self-government, and they had been told by the present Government that they were never to have that self-government. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian also said he could understand their abhorrence of a law which was an alien law, for the defects of that law and rule were enormous. In these circumstances it seemed to him to be most desirable that Her Majesty's Government should not proclaim the wonderful doctrine which had been enunciated by the noble Lord at Belfast. The Irish people had been told by his right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) that they could not pay the judicial rents, and on the division the flower of the Liberal Party voted in favour of the contention of his right hon. Friend. Under those circumstances, it was very serious that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should enunciate his wondrous non-Constitutional doctrine—that if any subjects of Her Majesty considered that a law was unjust to them they had a right to resist by arms that law. It was vain to hope that the efforts of his hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) to quiet the Irish under their present wrongs would be successful if these views were to be enunciated by the noble Lord, and if they were to be regarded as the views of the entire Conservative Party. Dissentient Liberals did not agree with the noble Lord, and he (Mr. Labouchere) would be glad to know whether the Conservatives agreed with him in regard to this matter. In the last Parliament the noble Lord was exceedingly anxious that this charge might be brought against him, in order that he might reply to it. The noble Lord urged the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian to give a day for the discussion of the Motion of the hon. Member for South Belfast; but the right hon. Gentleman was unable to give a day at that time owing to the pressure of Public Business. Yesterday the charge was made again, not in a direct manner, but incidentally alluded to in the course of a discussion on another Amendment; and the noble Lord declined to rise in his place and state whether he accepted, repudiated, regretted, or apologized for what he had said. The Government intended to ignore that it was officially acknowledged that the judicial rents were too high, and in the face of that and their other conduct they could not wonder if the Irish Chief Secretary's efforts at putting down Irish disturbance would not be successful. The same thing would result if there were no protest, no repudiation of the species of chartered revolt which the noble Lord had been the author of. The main duty of the Government was to maintain law and order, and the reason he (Mr. Labouchere) moved this Amendment was to ascertain whether the Conservative Party agreed with the opinions of the noble Lord, and to give every Gentleman on the Conservative side of the House an opportunity to free himself from the odium cast upon the Conservative Party, by registering his vote in favour of the Amendment. As he had said, in the last Parliament the noble Lord was most anxious to meet the charge brought against him, and he now gave the noble Lord the opportunity he then sought for. If the noble Lord wished judgment to go by default; if he were ashamed of those Belfast words, and did not like to say so; or if he did not desire, as a Minister of the Crown, to humiliate his dignity by endorsing the irresponsible frivolity which characterized him when in Opposition, the noble Lord would sit silent. But if the noble Lord should allow judgment to go by default the House ought not to do so. As law-abiding citizens, who protested against these revolutionary doctrines which rendered all law and order impossible, hon. Members should consider it their duty to register their votes upon the language of the noble Lord, unless he withdrew or expressed regret for it. ["Oh, oh!"] There could be no doubt that the noble Lord's utterances needed explanation; and that was why he (Mr. Labouchere) gave the House the opportunity of saying whether or not it thought so too, by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Address, the words —"And we humbly declare to Your Majesty, that certain language used and published by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in regard to the action which ought to be taken by a certain section of the Irish people, should the Bill for the better Government of Ireland (1886) pass into Law, was calculated to provoke breaches of the Law, and ought to be publicly withdrawn, in view of the preservation of the peace of Ireland."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Mr. Speaker—Sir, "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird;" and of all the unskilful and clumsy Parliamentary fowlers of whose manœuvres it has been my lot to be a witness, I never met a sorrier practitioner than the hon. Member opposite the senior Member for Northampton. In the various snares and arts and wiles with which he distinguished himself in the last Parliament he succeeded only in this—that he made himself the laughing stock of the Parliament and of the public; and he appears to be desirous to add to-night to his already great reputation in that respect. Now, Sir, he invites me, under the cover of quotations from a speech, to re-open the controversy as to the effect of the repeal of the Union. Sir, I flatly decline to respond to his invitation. I did not reply last night to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt), not from any want of courtesy to him, but because I considered, and because I believed, that most of my Friends on this side of the House considered the question had been amply dealt with by my right hon. Friend and Colleague the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). My right hon. Friend met the charges that were advanced by the hon. Member for South Sligo (Mr. Sexton). He disputed their value and their accuracy; and he stated that he considered that the speech, under the circumstances of the time, and viewing the circumstances to which it was directed, was a justifiable one. But, Sir, I considered that that perfectly well represented—I knew that that perfectly represented—the views of the Government; and I could see no good whatever in myself contributing to the prolongation of a controversy that could only serve to inflame Party passions, which, at the present moment, it is certainly not the desire of the Government to arouse, and the arousing of which cannot possibly serve any public or any useful object. Sir, it is perfectly clear—and this really is my best answer to these accusations, which I make once and for all—it is perfectly clear that if there was a shred of a shadow of a shade of a foundation, or if there was a shade of a shadow of a shred of a foundation, for any one, or any portion, of these charges which have been brought forward so freely and so glibly, it is perfectly certain that I should not now be filling the position which, by the favour of the Sovereign, by the friendship and the confidence of my Colleagues, and by the support of hon. Gentlemen behind me, I have the honour for the time to fill. And this I say, in conclusion—that nobody is better aware of the utter worthlessness and emptiness and preposterous childishness of the accusations which have been brought forward than the hon. Member for Northampton himself.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said, he rose for the purpose of moving an Amendment to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere); and, though he was aware that it might be inconvenient to Her Majesty's Government, yet he thought he should be able to show the House that the extreme gravity of the case warranted him in taking the course he felt it his duty and was about to pursue. There was now a very gloomy prospect of sitting here for four or five weeks longer. ["Oh, oh"] Well, that might not be an attractive prospect to hon. Members who lived in England, Scotland, and Wales; but, from what they were told was the prospective condition of Ireland, it appeared that it would be well for hon. Members who lived in Ireland to take up their permanent abode in the House of Commons. They learned that there was to be in Ireland a condition of crime, outrage, and disorder. But why? The position of Ireland at the present time, so far as he could see, except in one or two localities, was not particularly suggestive of crime. There was little distress, and the position of the majority of the farmers was not altogether unsatisfactory. He intended to call attention to very grave circumstances affecting the honour and dignity of the House in the persons of certain of its Members. With this object he would move an Amendment. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, if hon. Members would look at the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton they would see what he meant. He (Colonel Saunderson) proposed to leave out all the words from the word "used," in the Amendment, to the word "calculated," at the end, and to insert the following words:—

> "By certain Members of this House, and their participation in Conventions held in Foreign Countries in reference to Irish affairs, have given colour to the allegations which have been publicly made and extensively circulated throughout the United Kingdom that such persons are or have been members or associates of the Fenian Brotherhood of the United States, or of the Irish Republican Brotherhood are,"

He made no accusation—she merely brought the matter forward in order that hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway might have an opportunity of solemnly declaring that they were not and never had been connected with either of the two organizations named. The great question decided at the last Election was an appeal to the people on the question of Home Rule, and it was made under the shadow of a great and honoured name—that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). But he did not think it likely that the question would ever again be put before the country under the same shadow. It might be made under the shadow of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); but he did not believe that right hon. Gentleman's shadow would afford it sufficient support. But, under whatever auspices the question came before the country, he was satisfied that the verdict of the people would be even more decided in its condemnation than at the last Election. When Parliament should have been adjourned or prorogued hon. Members opposite would, doubtless, visit the constituencies. What he wanted them to do was to fight the battle in the open day, and to tell the country their real policy. He was ready to fight hon. Members at any time either in the House or outside. He did not mind fighting the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) either in the House or out of it; but he wished to fight the battle in the open day, and before he engaged in war he should like to understand clearly what he was fighting about. The fact was that there appeared to be two policies—one for the House of Commons and one for outside. ["Oh, oh!"] The question had become more serious since the Home Rulers had obtained certain distinguished recruits. The policy of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been accepted by the late Prime Minister, and endorsed by the right hon. Member for Derby. According to the right hon. Member for Derby, the policy of the hon. Member for Cork was a policy of Parliamentary action. It was, the right hon. Gentleman said, by such action that he intended to gain his object. Now, a short time ago a Convention was held at Chicago, and a deputation of Irishmen attended, the members of the deputation being Mr. J. Redmond, M.P., Mr. Deasy, M.P., and Mr. W. O'Brien, who had been a Member, and who would probably soon return to the House. These Gentlemen went to America to explain the policy of the hon. Member for Cork. At the Convention, which was summoned with a view to support the Party of the hon. Member and to stimulate the subscribers to its funds, they met a Mr. Finerty, a gentleman of very advanced opinions, who declared that if there was any way by which he could harass and annoy England, and keep her awake at nights, he would favour it. Mr. O'Brien went over and met Mr. Finerty, and said—

> "I am extremely glad to make your acquaintance. I look upon it as a great honour to come to Chicago in such company."

Mr. O'Brien was the accredited agent of the hon. Member for Cork, and yet he approached Chicago in company with that tremendous patriot who had used such tremendous language.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): Was Mr. O'Brien present when Mr. Finerty made that speech?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: No. I do not wish to misrepresent anybody; but Mr. O'Brien would probably have been informed of what had happened before he arrived. The hon. Member for Cork, no doubt, hoped that when he next made an appeal to the English constituencies for Home Rule for Ireland the masses and working classes would rally round him. But he would like to draw the attention of the working classes to a Constitution drawn up by a committee appointed by the Chicago Convention, consisting of Messrs. Dillon, Redmond, and Deasy, the 5th section of which ran as follows:—

> "To hurt the enemy where he will feel it most, by refusing to purchase any article of English manufacture, and by using all legitimate influence to discourage tradesmen from keeping English manufactures on sale."

When the British working classes knew that he sent his agents to Chicago to draw up this Constitution, they would not give him the hearty reception he anticipated. The Chicago and Westminster Home Rule policies did not coincide. America was the El Dorado of Irish politicians, where they got those supplies which were necessary. He understood that the advanced party found most of those funds, and amongst them there appeared to be a vision of action more dangerous, more perilous, and more heroic than moving the adjournment of the debate in the House. He took the following from *The New York Herald* of August 25—

> "Mr. Redmond, M.P., who was introduced to the Chicago Convention by Judge Fitzgerald as the trusted and recognized representative of Mr. Parnell, came there at Mr. Parnell's request and used this language—'The principle underlying the movement for which this Convention is assembled is the unquestioned recognition of the nationality of Ireland. We are working not simply for the removal of grievances, or the amelioration of the material condition of our people. Once again all thoughts of amity with England have been banished from the minds of Irishmen, and to-day we stand face to face with our hereditary foes. I assert here to-day that the government of Ireland by England is an impossibility, and I believe it to be our duty to make it so."

These words were used by a Member of that House, the accredited agent and delegate of the hon. Member for Cork. Under those circumstances, he thought he was justified in asking the hon. Member for Cork, in his place, to tell the House and the country which of the two policies he was about to choose, and on which platform he was about to take his stand—that of Chicago or Westminster—to fight. He would also like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) whether he intended to adopt the policy enunciated in such moderate language by the hon. Member for Cork in the House of Commons, or the policy announced in such terrific tones by the accredited agents sent by the hon. Member for Cork to America? When the English people read the challenge he (Colonel Saunderson) now threw down to the hon. Member for Cork, he hoped they would see that the hon. Member was bound in honour and in all consistency to state in clear and distinct terms which policy he intended to adopt and on which platform he intended to fight. At all events, he would not be able to stand any longer with one foot on the Westminster platform and the other on the Chicago platform. He (Colonel Saunderson) himself had no doubt as to the result of an appeal to the English people. At the last Election they dispelled for ever the illusion that the majority of them were in favour of Home Rule, or that Parliament would safely pass through a Bill for the dismemberment of the Empire. He did not think hon. Members below the Gangway were sorry for the result of the Election. The atmosphere of the House and residence in London must have affected them in the same way that it had affected him, and made him feel that it was the highest honour of his life to sit within those walls. The Bill, too, if it had not been thrown out, would have consigned them permanently to provincial obscurity; whereas now they could fulfil the highest and pleasantest functions of an Irish patriot, by doing their duty and living in London at the expense of other people. The discussion that might take place on his Amendment would probably form the keynote of the speeches during the autumn campaign. Returning to the consideration of the proceedings of the Chicago Convention, he would point out that the members of it did not altogether agree with Mr. Finerty. Mr. A. Sullivan wound up the proceedings by saying—

> "While Mr. Finerty has given expression to some views with which I will not say I disagree, let us all agree to make a sacrifice that is sometimes more than the sacrifice of our lives, the sacrifice of our self-suppression for the common cause."

Hence the House would learn that the moderate Party did not disagree with Mr. Finerty, but thought it more convenient that he should not give expression to sentiments that would alienate public opinion in England and open the eyes of the working men in this country, who were loyal to the Crown, to the fact that this Home Rule movement was one which had for its aim the degradation and disintegration of the Empire. He would listen anxiously for the reply of the hon. Member for Cork as to which policy he would adopt. He now desired to call attention to another point—namely, the second part of the Amendment, which dealt with the honour and dignity of the House. A pamphlet had been circulated largely through the country. [An hon. MEMBER: Anonymously.] Yes; anonymously. He said nothing about the truth, or the reverse, of the contents of it; but it was sold everywhere, and had been in circulation for a long time. The circulation of a pamphlet like that, making allegations against the honour of hon. Gentlemen in that House, ought to be at once dealt with by them. That he would leave to the hon. Gentlemen themselves. Those hon. Gentlemen should get up in their places, and declare clearly that they had no connection, and never had any connection or sympathy, with the organizations which he mentioned in his Amendment. The following statement appeared in the pamphlet:—

> "This was the oath I took in the presence of Almighty God—'I solemnly swear allegiance to the Irish Republic, now virtually established, and to take up arms when called upon to defend its independence and integrity, and also swear to yield implicit obedience to my superior officers.'"

[*Cries of* "This is all anonymous; who wrote it?"] Hon. Members asked him who wrote it? He could not say who wrote it; but if he could not give the hon. Member the name of the author, he could give him the name of the publisher. The pamphlet went on to say—

> "It may be said I am now betraying that oath. If so, it is because I can no longer bear to see my unfortunate countrymen robbed and ruined by a set of scheming politicians who enjoy snug berths. I have not imitated the example of those distinguished Members of Parliament and Republican brethren."

Let hon. Members read the names given in the pamphlet. Well, Sir, it is stated that among those who took this oath were Mr. J. O'Kelly——

MR. PARNELL: I rise to Order, Sir. I wish to know whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman, under cover of reading a pamphlet which he acknowledges to be anonymous and without any authority, is entitled to attack hon. Members of this House, and to charge them with being members of a treasonable conspiracy and with having taken two oaths—one to support this treasonable conspiracy, and the other to support Her Majesty in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman has stated the sources from which he derives his information, and, having regard to any names he mentioned, of course he takes upon himself the responsibility of the course he is adopting. I do not think that I can interfere.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: The book I refer to is sold at all the railway stations, and is published at 169, Piccadilly, London, by William Ridgway. It is sold everywhere. I have no responsibility for the book. I do not myself say that any hon. Members of this House have taken this oath; but——

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I rise to Order, Sir. The hon. and gallant Gentleman declines to take the responsibility upon himself; but he was proceeding to quote from the book.

MR. SPEAKER: What I said was that the responsibility rests upon the hon. and gallant Gentleman as a Member of this House, and there is no point of Parliamentary Order upon which I can interfere.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I take the responsibility on myself.

MR. PARNELL: I rise to a point of Order. [*Cries of* "Order!"] Do I understand that your ruling, Sir, is to this effect—that the hon. and gallant Member is entitled to accuse other hon. Members of any offence in the way he has, provided he gets some book or some anonymous pamphlet and reads the accusation out of it? Because under those circumstances, if a pamphlet were written accusing the hon. and gallant Member of being a murderer, I should be entitled to come here and read the accusation out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman has given his authority for the statement he is making. The House must judge of the value of that authority for itself. It is not for me to interfere on a point of Order in this instance.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said, if the hon. Member for Cork accused him of murder, on whatever authority, he should be only too glad to have it repeated in that House, so that he might answer the accusation; and he should have thought that hon. Members opposite would have been only too glad to answer the pamphlet. It might be a vile slander for all he knew. It was the duty of any hon. Member to bring forward any such accusation; for if it were true it would unfit a Member from taking a seat in that House. However, he would accede to the wish of the hon. Member for Cork and hon. Members below the Gangway, and not proceed to mention the names.

Mr. PARNELL: I made no request. I simply submitted a point of Order to the Speaker, and the Speaker ruled it against me.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: If the hon. Member is afraid——[*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. PARNELL: I am not in the least afraid of anything the hon. and gallant Gentleman may read.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: Then, if the hon. Member does not fear, I will read the names. [The hon. and gallant Member then proceeded to give a list of the names of persons who, in the pamphlet, were alleged to have taken the Fenian oath, among them being J. J. O'Kelly, William O'Brien, M. Harris, T. P. O'Connor, T. Healy, J. H. M'Carthy, J. Redmond, and W. Redmond.] Some of these men had sworn allegiance to Her Majesty. That was a very serious question. He had entered into the matter because they were now still at the preliminary stage of the great battle that they would have to fight; and he wished to know on what platform the hon. Members opposite intended to fight. They had won the first fall; they wished to take care that they won the second. Let the hon. Member for Cork lay down the platform on which he intended to fight, and they would be always ready to meet him. The hon. and gallant Gentleman concluded by moving his Amendment.

Colonel WARING (Down, N.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment,

To leave out from the word "used," to the word "calculated," in order to insert the words "by certain Members of this House, and their participation in Conventions held in Foreign Countries in reference to Irish affairs, have given colour to the allegations which have been publicly made and extensively circulated throughout the United Kingdom that such persons are or have been members or associates of the Fenian Brotherhood of the United States, or of the Irish Republican Brotherhood are,"—(*Colonel Saunderson*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Lord Randolph Churchill rose, but

Mr. PARNELL rose with him, and said: Mr. Speaker, before the noble Lord addresses the House I wish to consult you first on a point of Order. I wish to direct your attention, Sir, to the ruling which you gave when my Amendment upon the Address was under discussion. When a point of Order was raised in regard to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), that he was not entitled to speak upon the Main Question in the discussion of that Amendment as well as upon the Amendment itself, and that he should confine himself strictly to the Amendment, you ruled that the right hon. Gentleman must confine himself strictly to the Amendment. Now, Sir, what I wish to submit is this—the Amendment which has been moved by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) proposes to leave out certain words from the original Amendment, in order to substitute certain other words; and although it might have been possible, and may be possible, and is possible, to discuss an Amendment which proposes the addition of certain words to the Main Question without reference to the Main Question, it certainly is not possible to discuss an Amendment which proposes to leave out certain words, in order to substitute certain other words, without entering into the merits of the original question, in order to decide the question whether they should be substituted or not. I know of no way in which a discussion could be taken on the merits, if the rule you laid down before is to be applied in this case. It is manifest that on this occasion, when the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh proposes to substitute certain words for certain other words in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), we cannot discuss the question without discussing the merits both of the original Amendment and of the proposed Amendment thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. Gentleman I have to state that I think he is under some misapprehension. My former ruling was that when an Amendment was proposed to the Address the whole subject of the Address was not open for discussion; but the debate must be confined to the specific Amendment proposed. In this case there is an Amendment proposed to be added to the Address; but before that question arises, or rather before the decision of the House can be taken upon it, another Amendment has been made in order to alter the words which it is proposed to add; and clearly, therefore, the Question before the House is the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton, and proposed to be altered by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh. Therefore, both the question of the speeches of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) and the assertions of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh are now before the House, and both matters may be properly discussed.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): I think it might be well that I should, without delay, state to the House the course which the Government propose to take on the Amendment moved by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). We shall oppose that Amendment, on the ground that we cannot, under any circumstances, concede that it relates to the matter of the Report in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As we conceive that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) is open to the imputation that it would lead to an unprofitable waste of the time of the House, I am bound to say that we think that the further Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh comes under the same category. I am strongly of opinion that the matters dealt with in the pamphlet are not matters such as this House can deal with, but that they ought to be decided in a Court of Law, and that no possible good can arise from any action the House may take. Therefore, when the time comes for the division—which I hope may not be long delayed—we shall take exactly the same course as that which we took with regard to the two Amendments having reference to Burmah. We shall vote "Aye" to the first Question put from the Chair, which will have the effect, if carried, of negativing the second Amendment—that of the hon. and gallant Member, and then we shall vote "No" to the second Question, which will have the effect of negativing the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN (Dublin, College Green) said, that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), who had just addressed the House, referred to the Chicago Convention, and had a great deal to say about it. He omitted, however, to state the most important fact connected with that Convention, which was that a resolution was passed declaring that upon the concession to Ireland of a measure of Home Rule such as was proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) there would be an end at once and for ever of the long strife, turmoil, and contention between the two countries. That was a most important omission on the part of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The hon. and gallant Gentleman stated that the Convention was mainly composed of members of the Fenian Brotherhood. He (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) should like to know what right the hon. and gallant Member had to make any complaints of the Fenian Brotherhood? The Fenian Brotherhood had been disloyal to the British Crown, and had attempted insurrection in Ireland; but, considering the doctrine preached by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh during the late Election, and by the noble Lord the present Leader of the House of Commons, the Fenian Brotherhood had been justified in their action.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I made no complaint against the Fenian Brotherhood.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that the hon. and gallant Member had referred to the Fenian Brotherhood in America, and everyone knew in what spirit and for what purpose he made the reference. It had been proclaimed on Irish platforms, and within the walls of that House, that because a certain Party in Ireland, who were in a minority, were to be subjected to laws which they said would oppress them and injure them, they would be not only warranted, but bound to have recourse to force, and to resist to the best of their ability the operation of those laws. That principle had been advocated in the House of Commons by right hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches. What right, therefore, had they to attach the name of rebel to the Fenian Brotherhood? They would be rebels themselves, according to their own showing, if they were subjected to one-twentieth part of the grievous wrongs, injuries, and oppressions which the Catholic and Nationalist people of Ireland had had to endure for generation after generation. The hon. and gallant Member challenged the Irish Members to say whether they had sympathy with the Fenian Brotherhood. He (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) would tell the hon. and gallant Gentlemen, although he felt in no wise called upon to do so, that he had sympathy with the Fenian Brotherhood. He did not, however, approve of their methods; and many things that they said and did he believed to be unwise and unjustifiable. These men were his countrymen, who with a feeling of wrong and injury in their hearts, seeing no other chance of obtaining justice for their country, and finding Constitutional action vain and useless, took the wild and the foolish idea into their heads of rising in arms against the power of England and making a struggle for Irish liberty, whether they won or whether they lost. To a certain extent he had a great and high respect for these men; he sympathized with them as brave, though unwise men. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had quoted against the Nationalist Members an anonymous pamphlet. Why did not the author of that pamphlet put his name to it, so that they might know what value to attach to his statements? The coward skulked in the dark. The hon. and gallant Member made a great point of the fact that the pamphlet sold largely. No doubt it did; but he might tell the hon. and gallant Member that any pamphlet would sell largely in England if it denounced and abused the Irish people. All caricatures of the Irish people had sold largely in England; but the English people were now beginning to have fairer and juster notions of the Irish people and of their cause. If the hon. and gallant Member would add four or five pages of calumny and slander to the pamphlet and publish a new edition of it, it would have a large additional sale. The hon. and gallant Member said he did not strike below the belt — ["Oh, no!"]—but he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) called it striking below the belt to quote charges from a cowardly and anonymous libeller. The hon. and gallant Member made great professions of being ready to fight anywhere; but that was all swagger and bunkum. Of course, the so-called Loyalists always imagined themselves splendid fellows; but they had been correctly described by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), in a recent debate, as being, both now and in the past, the curse of the country. They had kept ill-will and animosity seething in Ireland. If the majority in Ireland had been treated as the so-called "Loyal" minority had been treated, there would have been much less disaffection. What the Loyalists were doing was striving to prevent such measures as would give the majority some excuse for being contented with the rule of England. The published Correspondence of the Marquess Cornwallis showed what were the character and conduct in 1798 and 1799 of the Orange Loyalists, whom their descendants were now called upon to emulate. The great difficulty of the Marquess Cornwallis was to restrain the Irish Yeomanry and Militia from plundering the people, burning their houses, and committing other outrages; and he complained that he was charged with lenity by the Loyalist Party because of his efforts to repress these outrages, which threatened to drive the people into rebellion again. He should like to read just a few historical extracts in support of his observations. They would be taken not from the pages of any Catholic or Nationalist historian, but from the published Correspondence of the noble Marquess, who was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at the period referred to, in the years 1798 and 1799. Soon after his arrival in the country he found it necessary to issue the following document:—

> "General Orders.
>
> "Ballinamore, August 31, 1798.
>
> "It is with very great concern that Lord Cornwallis finds himself obliged to call on the general officers and the commanding officers of regiments in particular, and in general on the officers of the Army, to assist him in putting a stop to the licentious conduct of the troops, and in saving the wretched inhabitants from being robbed, and in the most shocking manner ill-treated by those to whom they have a right to look for safety and protection. Lord Cornwallis declares that if he finds the soldiers of any regiment have had opportunities of committing those excesses from the negligence of their officers, he will make those officers answerable for their conduct; and that if any soldiers are caught either in the act of robbery, or with the articles of plunder in their possession, they shall instantly be tried, and immediate execution shall follow their conviction. A Provost Marshal will be appointed, who will with his guard march in the rear of the Army, and who will patrol about the villages and houses in the neighbourhood of the camp."

Such was the character, such was the behaviour of the men whose conduct the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer asked the Orangemen of Belfast to act up to. Here was another piece of evidence on the subject, drawn from the same source. The Marquess Cornwallis, writing to the Duke of Portland on July 8, 1798, said—

> "The Irish Militia are totally without discipline; contemptible before the enemy when any serious resistance is made to them, but ferocious and cruel in the extreme when any poor wretches, either with or without arms, come within their power; in short, murder appears to be their favourite pastime."

That was the example which the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer asked the Belfast Orangemen to act up to; and, no doubt, they did their very best to act on his advice. In another letter, bearing date September 30, 1798, the Lord Lieutenant said—

> "The country is daily becoming more disturbed. Religious animosities increase, and, I am sorry to say, are encouraged by the foolish violence of all the principal persons who have been in the habit of governing this Island; and the Irish Militia, from their repeated misbehaviour in the field and their extreme licentiousness, are fallen into such universal contempt and abhorrence, that when applications are made for the protection of troops it is often requested that Irish Militia may not be sent."

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) rose to Order, and asked whether they were discussing the Revolution of 1798 or the Amendments?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) is out of Order.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN, continuing, said, that he was addressing himself to the Amendments. One of the Amendments before the House had reference to the language used by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer when addressing the Orangemen of Belfast; he asked them to prove themselves worthy of their forefathers in 1798; and he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) was showing what was the plain purport and meaning of such language. Of course, the Orangemen in those days, as now, called themselves the Loyal Party; but here is what the Marquess Cornwallis said of the Loyalists of his time in one of his letters to Major General Ross—

> "The greatest difficulty which I experience is to control the violence of our loyal friends, who would, if I did not keep the strictest hand upon them, convert the system of martial law (which God knows is of itself bad enough) into a more violent and intolerable tyranny than that of Robespierre. The vilest informers are hunted out from the prisons to attack, by the most barefaced perjury, the lives of all who are suspected of being, or of having been, disaffected; and, indeed, every Roman Catholic of influence is in great danger."

He did not like to detain the House by reading further extracts of that character; he had many of them in his hand; but he would read only one or two others for the purpose of making still more clear to the House what sort of memories were appealed to, and what sort of men were held up as models for imitation in the speech of the noble Lord to the Orangemen of Belfast. Here was another letter of the Marquess Cornwallis to his friend Major General Ross. It was dated July 24, 1798—

> "There is no law here, either in town or country, but martial law, and you know enough of that to see all the horrors of it, even in the

best administration of it; judge, then, how it must be conducted by Irishmen heated with passion and revenge. But all this is trifling compared to the numberless murders that are hourly committed by our people without any process or examination whatever. The Yeomanry are in the style of the Loyalists in America, only much more numerous and powerful, and a thousand times more ferocious. The Irish Militia, with few officers, and these chiefly of the worst kind, follow closely on the heels of the Yeomanry in murder and every kind of atrocity, and the Fencibles take a share, although much behindhand with the others. . . . The conversation of the principal persons of the country all tends to encourage this system of blood, and the conversation, even at my table, where you will suppose I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, burning, &c., and if a priest has been put to death the greatest joy is expressed by the whole company."

Again, writing to the Duke of Portland in June, 1798, he gave the following account of the savagery of the troops, both officers and men:—

"The accounts that you see of the numbers of the enemy destroyed in every action are, I conclude, greatly exaggerated; from my own knowledge of military affairs I am sure that a very small proportion of them only could be *killed in battle*, and I am much afraid that any man in a brown coat who is found within several miles of the field of action is butchered without discrimination. It shall be one of my first objects to soften the ferocity of our troops, which, I am afraid, in the Irish corps at least, is not confined to the private soldiers."

Did the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer know what he was talking of when he incited the Belfast Orangemen to show they had in them the spirit of their forefathers as displayed in 1798? It must be assumed that he did; and there could be no doubt of the sense in which the Orangemen understood his words. So ferocious and bloodthirsty was the spirit of the Loyal minority in those days that they made loud complaints of the humane Nobleman who had dared to put a check upon their career of outrage, pillage, and murder. In one of his letters at this time he gave the following account of them:—

"The principal persons of this country and the Members of both Houses of Parliament are, in general, averse to all acts of clemency. . . . They would pursue measures that could only terminate in the extirpation of the greater number of the inhabitants, and in the utter destruction of the country. The words Papists and priests are for ever in their mouths, and by their unaccountable policy they would drive four-fifths of the community into irreconcilable rebellion."

Again, writing to the Duke of Portland in defence of his alleged leniency towards the unfortunate people, he said—

"Your Grace may be assured that I shall omit no means in my power to encourage and animate the whole body of Yeomanry to a faithful and active discharge of their duty; but I never can permit them to take advantage of their military situation to pursue their private quarrels and gratify their personal resentments, or to rob and murder, at their discretion, any of their fellow-subjects whom they may think proper, on their own authority, to brand with the name of rebels."

Here is an extract from another letter of his, defending himself from the terrible charge of too great clemency towards the "rebels"—

"You write as if you really believe there was any foundation for all the lies and nonsensical clamour about my lenity. On my arrival in this country I put a stop to the burning of houses and murder of the inhabitants by the Yeomanry or any other persons who delighted in that amusement; to the flogging for the purpose of extorting confession, and to the free quarters, which comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country. If this be a crime, I fully acknowledge my guilt."

Even after the suppression of the Rebellion he wrote—

"The ferocity of the Loyalists will not for a long time permit the restoration of perfect tranquillity."

And he thus expressed his wonder at the folly of the Government in pampering a little faction in Ireland, instead of seeking to make friends of the great body of the people—

"It has always appeared to me a desperate measure for the British Government to make an irrevocable alliance with a small Party in Ireland—which Party has derived all its consequence from, and is, in fact, entirely dependent upon, the British Government—to wage eternal war against the Papists and Presbyterians of this Kingdom, which two sects, from the fairest calculations, comprise about nine-tenths of the community."

Well, the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer claimed for the Orangemen of the present day that they were the descendants of those heroes of 1798, and he asked them to show themselves worthy of their sires. They themselves traced their pedigree still further back, and they claimed to be descendants of the victors of the Boyne and "sons of William." But if they were sons of William they must be illegitimate sons, and degenerate sons also. The victors of the Boyne were brave soldiers, drawn from all parts of Europe—Dutchmen, Danes, Norwegians, Englishmen, Frenchmen, and others—and at the close of the campaign nearly all of them went back with King William to England. But there was another class of men at the Boyne, the camp followers, who were more likely to be the progenitors of the rioters of the present day. The Rev. George Story, chaplain to one of King William's regiments, an eye-witness of the scenes which he had described in his narrative of the war, told how they deported themselves at the battle of the Boyne. One of their works was to strip and rob the body of General Walker, the defender of Derry, when he fell in the action. Story says—

> "General Walker, going, as some say, to look after the Duke, was shot a little beyond the river, and stripped immediately; for the Scots-Irish that followed our camp were got through already (*i.e.*, across the river) and took off most of the plunder."

It had been said that the Orangemen had been taunted in that House with want of courage, and that they felt bound to show they could fight. Well, he had never denied the courage of the Orangemen, and did not want to taunt those whom the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) had called the "Corner Boys" and the "residuum" of Belfast with any want of courage. Ireland did not breed cowards of any Party or class, and he would only say that they were misguided and ignorant men. Sometimes the Orangemen threatened great things, but did nothing, and then, perhaps, they were laughed at. He believed that if a Home Bill had passed there would have been quieter times in Belfast. But he put it to the House, considering the antecedents of these men, considering their prejudices and their passions, and the nature of the memories which were kept ever fresh among them by the incendiary orators of their Party, whether the conduct of the noble Lord, in going among them and addressing to them the language that had been quoted from his speeches in this debate, was not merely reckless and mischievous, but criminal; and he hoped the House would show their condemnation of it by their vote on this Amendment.

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said, he would not have risen but for the unsatisfactory statement or explanation given by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) of the very inflammatory and exciting character of the language used in his speech at Belfast. He had listened that night, as he invariably listened, to a speech delivered by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), and all hon. Members would be prepared to admit that the hon. and gallant Member's sallies of wit never failed to amuse, even when his arguments failed to instruct or convince. He, however, felt some regret that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should have deemed it his duty—should have deemed it wise and prudent—to point his argument against hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House by references to which every Scotch and English Member of the House thought the most magnanimous conduct on the part of their Irish brethren, the Representatives at the Chicago Convention in America. It would, no doubt, be interesting to the House to learn whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman had ever on any occasion refused to accept rent from a tenant when he knew it could only be paid by money sent from America. The pointed argument came, he fancied, with questionable grace from the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The language used by the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) in his speech at Belfast, and especially in the peroration of the speech delivered to his constituents at South Paddington on February 12 — the language used on those occasions called for the immediate repudiation and condemnation of every hon. Member of that House. The House was told a few nights since by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh that the recent outbreak of rioting in Belfast was left as a legacy by the late Government to Her Majesty's present Advisers—a legacy, forsooth! from the late Government to their Successors. He (Mr. Fenwick) denied that. The recent outbreak of disturbances in Belfast was due to the immoderate and injudicious language used by the noble Lord the Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill) and by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen of the Tory Party. The noble Lord knew perfectly well the character of the people to whom his language was addressed in that speech at Belfast, and he (Mr. Fenwick) had no hesitation in saying that the language of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his Friends was used entirely for Party purposes, and with Party aims alone. He had listened, during the short time he had been a Member of the House, to extract after extract taken from speeches of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland representing the Nationalist Party—extracts read by hon. Members opposite; and, indeed, on almost every public platform in the country. Tory orators had endeavoured to fasten the responsibility on the Nationalist Party for causing crimes and outrages in Ireland by the inflammatory speeches they had made outside the House; but had the House heard a single word of repudiation or condemnation from the Tory Party of the language of the noble Lord in Belfast? Indeed, so far from there having been any repudiation from that Party, only on Wednesday afternoon the House had to listen to an attempted justification of those remarks—a justification which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was not very successful in establishing. If language such as that used by the noble Lord at Belfast came from responsible Advisers of Her Majesty—from Privy Councillors—then could there be surprise that crime and outrage followed very closely in the wake of the deliverance of such incendiary harangues? He would ask the House to listen to a quotation from the closing words of the noble Lord's speech to his constituents in Paddington on February 12 last—

"I believe,"

said the noble Lord—referring to his intended visit to Belfast and the message he intended to bear to the electors of that unhappy town—

"I believe there will be hundreds and thousands of English hearts—aye, and English hands, which, when the moment of trial comes, when the Protestants of Ireland are called on to give in the most practical and convincing form a demonstrative proof of their loyalty to the English Throne—I believe there will be found hundreds and thousands of English hearts and hands beside them, around them, and behind them, co-operating with them. Before the unity of the British Empire is for ever shattered, before the sun of the British Empire has commenced to set, a blow will have to be struck, a blow will be struck, the sound of which shall go into all the world, and the echoes of which shall reverberate to the uttermost corners of the earth."

Well, the blow had indeed been struck in Belfast. The inflammatory speech of the noble Lord had been reported by the local Press of Belfast; and the Orangemen of the unhappy town rightly divined the character of the noble Lord's words, and the outrage and crime perpetrated in the town of Belfast were but the necessary outcome of what he had termed the injudicious language used by the noble Lord, by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, and the injudicious letters which had been circulated throughout the country by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain). If the House was expected to repudiate and condemn the character of the violent language used by Leaders of the National Party in Ireland—and he held it was the duty of the House to do so—then, in all fairness and justice, they must also offer the strongest protest in their power against, and repudiation of, language such as that uttered by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was because he believed such language was immediately provocative of the riots and disturbances that had taken place in Belfast, resulting in loss of life and destruction of property, that he, as a Member for an English constituency now uttered the strongest protest in his power against such language as that of the noble Lord.

MR. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) said, that the outrages and disturbances in Belfast had occurred long after the Home Rule Bill of the late Government had been rejected by the House, and after the result of the General Election had been declared; therefore, it was impossible that they could have been the result of the language used by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), whose remarks at Belfast had referred entirely to the eventuality of the measure being carried. He would ask if the House considered it to be a proper state of affairs that certain hon. Members should receive subsidies from the United States of America? He maintained that it was not right that any persons holding seats in the British House of Commons should do so. The United States had their own business to attend to, and we had ours; there ought to be, therefore, no subsidies given by any alien State to persons in the British Parliament. He could not agree with what the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) said—that the State ought to give aid to the Irish landlords, and as to the desirableness of the British taxpayer coming to their aid. He did not think the British taxpayer would be willing to put his hand in his pocket for such a purpose, unless he had ample security for the interest. He thought that the debate on the Address had caused a very considerable waste of time; and the real question before the House was whether it was not now time to close the discussion upon it, when it was recollected that no fewer than 23 days had already been taken up this year in discussing the Speeches from the Throne. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton had been disapproved beforehand by the electors of the Metropolis, who, having the speeches of the noble Lord in Ulster before them, had sent 49 Conservative Members to that House to support the policy which the noble Lord had enunciated in those speeches. It must be remembered that the Metropolitan Members represented a population of about 3,500,000, whose opinions were at least equal in weight to those of the Nationalists of Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the hon. Member was not speaking at all to the Amendment before the House.

Mr. WEBSTER said, he would oppose both Amendments, because neither of them was worthy of the consideration of the House; and he trusted, therefore, that the House would quickly come to a decision, and would at once proceed to pass the Order of the Day relating to Her Majesty's Speech, with a view of proceeding with the Business of the nation.

Mr. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) said, he begged to congratulate the hon. Member for East St. Pancras (Mr. Webster) on his maiden effort. Hon. Members opposite who represented Irish constituencies were fighting for a class with whose interests they were identified. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) had been charged with having incited to disturbance, treason, and rebellion in Ireland, and yet he had not dared to get up and defend his conduct. The noble Lord had deliberately used in Belfast incendiary language which he knew must necessarily lead to disturbance. As a consequence Ulster had fought, and he appealed to hon. Members to say whether she had been in the right in doing so. He (Mr. E. Harrington) maintained that the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought either to take the responsibility of his language, or make a decent apology to the House for his incendiary speech. If the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews) was not ashamed of his religion, he should like to see the right hon. Gentleman get up and dissociate himself from one who incited to the persecution of men of the same creed as himself. The hon. and gallant Member for Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) had taunted them with being payees of the Chicago Convention. He (Mr. E. Harrington) believed that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had been put up to raise a side issue and draw away attention from the criminal conduct of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Every speech in which the hon. and gallant Member for Armagh made these insinuating attacks on the Nationalist Party, that they were there merely for the exercise of a selfish purpose, for paltry pelf, to sell or betray their country according as they were paid to do, the one or the other was a blow below the belt. But these blows came with ill grace from the descendants of those who betrayed their country and their country's liberties in times gone by. It seemed to him that if a band of men, representing a poor and persecuted country, determined to resign all the purposes of their own lives and to give themselves up wholly and solely to the interests of their country, it was no discredit to them that their countrymen should maintain them. Then it was said that they were poor men, and could not live in London without being paid. It was no disgrace to be poor; but when their position was contrasted with that of the Irish landlords, they could not but ask how they attained their position. Theirs was a blood-stained history, and there was no other country in which the landlords had so ill performed the office of resident gentry. The conspiracy of silence on the Treasury Bench was the conspiracy of guilt, and he had no doubt the country would pass judgment upon the noble Lord, who had allowed it to go by default against him.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) said, he congratulated the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) upon having had the courage to resist the efforts made by hon. Members opposite to draw him into this discussion. With reference to the charge that the noble Lord had incited to riot in Belfast, it was the fact that riots had taken place there long before the noble Lord made his speech, and even long before the Home Rule Bill came into existence. It could not be doubted that the tension of feeling existing in Belfast was the slow accumulation of various causes, nor could it be denied that what had been going on all over Ireland for years had had a great deal to do with it. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) had been found fault with, because they were said to have made rebellious speeches. It could not be maintained that rebellion was wrong under all circumstances. There was sometimes a vindication for it. But if right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the other side thought that the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Member were "rebels," why did they not arraign them for it and have them tried as such? In the course of these long debates nothing had surprised him more than to see hon. Members below the Gangway rise one after another and denounce in tones of indignation those who had recently, perhaps, taken a leaf out of their own book.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I desire to make a few remarks upon the speech of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). The chief part of the observations of the hon. and gallant Member had reference to Fenianism; and by implication the hon. and gallant Member endeavoured, from an anonymous communication, to fasten Fenianism on hon. Members on this side of the House. [Colonel SAUNDERSON: I did nothing of the kind.] I said by implication, and I will give the exact phrase of the hon. and gallant Member. He stated that if hon. Members on these Benches did not belong to such an organization he would give them an opportunity of disavowing their connection with it. Now, I have never been a Fenian myself, and, thank God, I have never been an Orangeman. Nor am I here to advocate the cause of Fenianism, but had I been a Fenian I certainly should not disavow it; and if the charge were pushed further, rather than disavow it, I would affirm my connection with that honourable Society. At any rate, I would infinitely prefer Fenianism to Orangeism. I look upon Fenianism rather as a patriotic and national organization; and whether the Fenians have been misguided or not, they are, in my judgment, much more unselfish than Orangemen. Orangeism is, to a large extent, an appeal to the pockets of certain persons, not only in the ordinary work of the organization, but for the selfish objects of its leaders, to enable them not only to maintain their position, but also to replenish their pockets. I am not now attacking the members of the Orange Society; I am prepared to admit that there are many respectable gentlemen connected with the Orange Association, but; if so, they are respectable gentlemen in spite of the Association to which they belong; because I maintain that Orangeism is inimical to liberty of opinion, to freedom of thought and action, and, hence, to the principles of true Protestantism. I see nothing, except to the advantage of Fenianism, that is different between it and Orangeism. The one is a secret Society, and the other is a secret Society. ["No!"]

MR. AMBROSE (Middlesex, Harrow): I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is within the Amendment before the House to discuss the relative merits of Fenianism and Orangeism?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not out of Order.

MR. JORDAN: I was saying that one was a secret Society, and the other was a secret Society. One was a Society that was said to encourage private drill, and the other is an organization which resorts to the same practices. It will be in the recollection of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) that, speaking at an Orange anniversary meeting at Enniskillen not long ago, the hon. and gallant Member recommended the brethren, who had previously met in secret conclave, to combine, to put on military dress, and to march and drill. [Colonel SAUNDERSON: I did nothing of the kind.] In that case my recollection must be very defective, for I was one of the persons in the crowd who listened to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and so charitable were his auditors that when they recognized that there was a person in the assembly who was a Liberal and a Land Leaguer they threatened to beat me. Therefore, I think that Orangeism and Orangemen have nothing whatever to boast of as being superior in any shape or form to the organization of Fenianism and the Fenians—of the two, the Fenian Organization is the more respectable. It did not sail under false colours. It neither sailed under the colours of religion and devotion to God, or loyalty to the Queen; but it stated boldly—"We are dissatisfied with the existing form of Government; we will fight against it." The members of the Fenian Organization did try to fight against the Government, and the only thing which made their efforts discreditable was the want of success which attended their efforts. If they had succeeded there would be no difficulty in regarding them as respectable men. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh said that the Irish Members have two policies. I altogether deny the assertion; but if we have two policies that is no novelty in the political world. The hon. and gallant Gentleman himself is an illustration of that. I recollect at one time, when I was much younger, that we looked upon him—that is to say, the few Liberals there then were in the North of Ireland—looked upon the hon. and gallant Gentleman as our rising hope, and the man we were ready to support against the Tories. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has changed his policy since that day, and now he is one of the most ardent and enthusiastic advocates of a Tory policy the very reverse of that which at one time he advocated. I want to know what is meant by a double policy? The Tory Party in 1866 had one policy in regard to the franchise; but in 1867 they had another. Whenever it has been expedient, the Tory Party have found it very convenient to have a double policy; and it cannot be denied that they have even coquetted very considerably with the Irish Nationalists. It has invariably been their policy to take all the aid and assistance they can get, and there can be very little doubt that if the Election before last had not turned out as it did their policy would have been much more conciliatory towards the Irish Nationalist Members than it has since been. Let me refer the House to a much greater man than any individual Member of the Tory Party—I refer to the Leader of the greatest Party in this House—the Liberal Party—the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). That right hon. Gentleman has had different policies at different times with regard to coercion. Not many years ago he was altogether in favour of the policy of coercion; but recently he has entirely given up that idea. The Tories have done the same. When they went into Office early in the present year they declared that, in the present state of Ireland, it was absolutely necessary to bring in a Coercion Bill. They have entirely changed that view now, and they are of opinion that coercion is altogether unnecessary. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh has stated that the National League in Ireland is supported by American gold. Well, what of that? Gold is the most powerful factor in all political struggles, and it is simply because we have got the gold that we are now able to fight the landlords with their own instruments and with their own tools. The fact that the Organization had money was the very first thing that made me join the Land League. [*A laugh.*] Allow me to explain, and I am glad to see hon. Members opposite so happy. I have no wish to transgress the Rules of the House; but I wish to explain that in the North of Ireland, before the Land League established a footing there, there were a few Tenant Right Associations that were purely local, and they had very little power. They had no combination or organization, and they were unable to do battle with the combined power of landlords and their agents and bailiffs. It was found that every organization of that kind was only short lived because it did not possess the gold. The landlords had all the gold; but by-and-bye America said that if we desired to continue tinue the battle against landlordism the money necessary to carry it on would be placed at our disposal, and it was then that I threw in my lot with the Organization and the Society that gave me the means of fighting the landlords. [*A laugh.*] I quite understand that laugh. I will come to the point in a moment, and when I have done I do not think that the hon. Members will laugh at me. I threw in my lot with the Organization which had the means of doing battle effectively against the tyranny and oppression of landlordism. I have taken the greatest possible delight in this Organization, because it has been able to procure American gold to assist it in meeting the blank cheques of Dukes and the subscriptions of loyal and patriotic Associations, and all those Associations of Dukes, Lords, and Squires who, as a class, are desirous of doing battle with the masses of the working people of England and Ireland. Another point the hon. and gallant Gentleman made was, that it was a discredit to be in this House at the expense of other people. [Colonel SAUNDERSON: No; I did not.] I beg the hon. and gallant Member's pardon, but I have the words down here on my notes, and he accused the Irish Members of being here at the expense of other people. Well, as far as I am concerned, I deny that accusation altogether. I am not here at the expense of other people. I will not adopt the course that was taken by my hon. Friend (Dr. Tanner) the other night in denying that charge; but I must say that men who have no sense of honour deserve very little consideration. Hon. Gentlemen opposite often talk of their fine sense of honour; but they think very little of hurting the feelings of others. I, for one, altogether repudiate the insinuation that I have been sent here at the expense of other people. But, Mr. Speaker, if it were so, I should think it a credit and an honour to be maintained and supported in this House by the subscriptions which come from America. Recollect that they do not come from foreigners, for I do not call subscriptions that come from my brothers, my uncles, and my friends in America, foreign money, and I should count it an honour to be maintained by subscriptions sent from America out of respect for Ireland, and the National cause, rather than to be maintained in this House by money wrung from misery, poverty, and hate by the Irish landlords from Irish tenants. What are the principal part of hon. Gentlemen in this House supported by? Are they not supported by the money of other people? Who makes the money? Is it not the tenant farmer who makes the money that supports the landlords here? While a certain proportion of it may be fairly and justly due and obtained, the larger part is wrung from the tenants of Ireland, and from the miserable small farmers in that country, who have to deny themselves food, and clothing, and covering in the winter nights in order that the rent may be sent over to London to the Irish landlord, to be spent in England, or on the Continent, in the Holy Land, or elsewhere. Sir, the tenants of Ireland have exhausted every possible means of making up the rent. Rent is but interest in another form, and I have known many instances in which tenants, to pay rent, robbed merchants and others of both principal and interest; and now the time has come when it is impossible any longer to continue the payment of such rent. There is another point in relation to America. The Irish in America are accused of calling upon the American people to "Boycott" the English manufacturer. [An hon. MEMBER: No!] I certainly understood the allegation to be that at the recent Chicago Convention the American citizens were asked by the Irish Representatives to refuse to take English manufactured goods. Now, I want to know what control the Irish National Party, or even the great English nation itself, can have over the action of the American people? How can we prevent any number of American citizens from meeting in a Convention, or otherwise, and passing any Resolution they choose? I do not see how it is possible for us to interfere, and it certainly would be an impertinence on our part to make any attempt to interfere, with the affairs of a foreign State. My answer to the observations of the hon. and gallant Gentleman is that if an American Convention chooses to pass a Resolution in reference to English manufacturers, we have no more control over them than England had when some of the United States declared their independence. I think I have now referred to the different points on which the hon. and gallant Gentleman has chosen to attack the Irish Party; and as to the Amendment he has moved to the Resolution, I trust that the House will emphatically reject it. I have only one word more to say, and it has reference to the action of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Belfast. I believe that for the moment that the mantle of an illustrious ancestor had descended upon him, although, probably, it was much too large for him. I have no doubt that the noble Lord felt that he was called upon to fire off some great guns; but what I do say is this—that in the language which was used by the noble Lord the most dangerous part of it is to be found in his peroration, and the peroration, from internal evidence, does not appear to have been carefully prepared. It was a peroration which showed that it was the result of a sudden inspiration, and it was wound up by a quotation from a poem familiar to us from the days of our childhood, as one which we were in the habit of reciting. It may well be that the inhabitants of Belfast—the Protestant inhabitants of Belfast—anticipated the meaning of the noble Lord; and although he only contemplated that there should be a resort to violence if a certain contingency arose, yet they felt that they ought to be wise in time, and anticipated the occasion. Therefore, it is not unjust or unfair for hon. Gentlemen who sit below the Gangway on this side of the House to attribute to the noble Lord that the language of the noble Lord in Belfast, to a considerable extent, was the cause of the outrageous attacks which took place in the streets of that town. I am not surprised at the way in which the question has been treated by the Government. They feel how grave a charge is made against their Leader; they feel that he is afraid to discuss the question, and that he has left it to the back Benches to vindicate his character. Sir, I hope the result of this debate will be to teach the noble Lord to exercise prudence on any future occasion when he may be called upon to address an excited population, and that it will be a lesson hereafter to him not to indulge in violent and intemperate language, the effect of which, in the present strained relations between the two countries and the two Parties in Ireland, it is impossible to contemplate with satisfaction. I trust that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) will be carried to a division, so that we may put on record that we, who represent the Liberals of England, sympathize to the full with the sentiments which have been expressed by the hon. Member, and by those who sit behind him below the Gangway, and in the condemnation which they have passed upon the language used by a Privy Councillor of the Queen and a high Minister of the Crown.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Mr. Speaker—Sir, I cannot quite understand the language of an hon. Gentleman—the Member for the Holderness Division of Yorkshire (Commander Bethell)—who spoke a few moments ago from the Conservative Benches with that *naïveté* and good feeling which endear him to the House. The hon. and gallant Gentleman entered into a defence of the sacred right of rebellion. I have no objection to the hon. and gallant Gentleman amusing himself in the House with such exercises. But there is something contradictory in the position of hon. Gentlemen opposite. They start off with eulogies of rebellion, and when they have exhausted themselves in that direction they turn round to these Benches and bring a charge of rebellion against us as one of the foulest and most criminal which can be preferred. Sir, I think it is necessary that I should take notice briefly of the remarks of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). I am surprised that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should think it becoming on his part to introduce into the debates of this House an amount of venom, and passion, and irritation which is usually wanting in our conflicts here. I do not think the hon. and gallant Gentleman was particularly happy in his efforts this evening, because he had scarcely proposed his Amendment when the noble Lord his Leader got up and promptly, and in the most emphatic terms, repudiated it. The hon. and gallant Gentleman claims to be a fair antagonist; but I confess that I am unable to reconcile that claim with the course he has pursued this evening, in having, under cover of an anonymous and slanderous pamphlet, preferred charges against hon. Members sitting upon these Benches, which he would not dare to make on his own responsibility. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has given to this pamphlet a gratuitous advertisement. He says that it is widely circulated. So it is, and I have no doubt that any pamphlet which attacks Ireland is sure of a large circulation at W. H. Smith's bookstall. Let me give the House some idea of the character of the pamphlet upon which the hon. and gallant Gentleman founds his attack. Certainly, if I were anxious to secure the defence of my political reputation and position from the attacks of my political opponents, I should owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. and gallant Gentleman and the author of this pamphlet. I may say that I have been found fault with by my countrymen for the moderation of my views. [*A laugh.*] They may not be moderate to the hon. Gentleman opposite; but they are to them. Nevertheless, in this pamphlet I have the high honour to be represented as a desperado, and the connecting link between the dynamite party and the Nationalists of Ireland. It is upon a pamphlet of this kind, containing the most grotesque calumnies against the Irish Members, that the hon. and gallant Member founds his attack upon us. As a matter of fact, the only Member of the Irish Party whom I know to have been connected with the Fenian Brotherhood is my hon. Friend the Member for South Mayo (Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien). The association of my hon. Friend with Fenianism is an historic fact. He was fined for it and condemned for it 20 years ago. He suffered the penalty. He is certainly not the man to incite others to rebellion and then skulk in shelter; but, with a manliness and a courage that even the bitterest of his political opponents must admire, he went out into the field, took the responsibility of his acts, regardless of consequences, risked his life, and lost his liberty. It is to the credit of my hon. Friend that, having endeavoured in the past to teach the Irish people that it was only by determined action that they could hope for success, having since undergone the penalty attached to his offence, he should now be able to enter this House, and manfully take part in its debates, conducting himself with a decency of demeanour which hon. Members opposite would do well to imitate. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) has alluded to the fact that the Irish people in America have subscribed large sums of money for the Irish cause in Ireland, and for the support and maintenance of some of the Members of this House. If it be a crime, all I can say is that I, for one, glory in it. I remember some years ago, before the Irish-American movement assumed its present proportions, that an old Member of this House came with an air of great alarm to my late lamented Friend, Mr. A. M. Sullivan, and said—"Mr. Sullivan, is it true that there are Members of the House of Commons who are paid for their Parliamentary services?" Mr. Sullivan replied—"I do not know that I can definitely answer the question; but I have heard that there are two Members who are paid." "Who are they," he asked, with his eyes enlarged at the prospect of having his curiosity gratified. "Well," said Mr. Sullivan, "one was a late lamented Member of this House, the Member for Stafford (Mr. Alexander Macdonald), and the other is my hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt." Now, will anybody desire to maintain that it is a reproach to my hon. Friend the Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt), who still possesses a seat in this House, that his services—his great and eminent services to the cause of his fellow-workmen—should receive the recognition of being supported by their voluntary subscriptions? And now let me say a word about these American subscriptions. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) is very much mistaken if he thinks it is a question we ever desire to shirk whenever we may be brought face to face with it. What is the secret of these subscriptions? They are attributable to two sources—first, the undying love of Ireland which her sons bear towards her in whatever part of the world they may happen to be. I will tell the hon. and gallant Gentleman that if, like me, he had gone to America—if he had passed through the great cities of America, and had met Irish people there, some of them 6,000 miles away from the shores of Ireland, and had seen their aspirations and desires, and the sacrifices they were making for the prosperity and elevation of their native country, I believe that even he and our Orange opponents would have been struck with feelings of admiration by their patriotism and love of Ireland. That is the first reason why these voluntary subscriptions have been made in America. The second reason is this. The money which the Irish-Americans subscribe to the Irish movement at home is the fine which they are willing to pay in order to relieve themselves of the annual tribute which they had to pay to the landlords of Ireland. Now, Sir, upon this point allow me to read a short extract from the evidence published in the third Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the Depression of Trade and Industry—a Commission appointed by a Tory Ministry. In the evidence of Mr. Murrough O'Brien, one of the gentlemen connected with the Land Commission in Ireland, in answer to Question 8,551, that gentleman said—

> "It is a common practice for farmers in Ireland to save money in order to send their children to America, not altogether with the object of providing for such children, but incidentally to provide for themselves also; because the children who go to America and do well there send remittances to their friends in Ireland. Various estimates have been made of the amount remitted in that way from America and other foreign countries. Of course, it is impossible to obtain a correct estimate of the amount remitted; but it may be placed, I think, at £1,000,000 a-year."

Mr. O'Brien was asked—

> "Is it not a matter accepted generally that a large portion of the money thus remitted goes toward the payment of rent? I think," said Mr. O'Brien, "there can be no doubt that a large portion of the money so remitted is applied to the payment of rent."

I would ask whether the friends of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, who are pressing for the payment of rack rents, ever refused any payment towards those rack rents because it came from American dollars sent over by Irish emigrants? Sir, the tragedy of Irish landlordism pursues the Irish race wherever it may go. Like the Nemesis of which the Greeks used to speak, it never stops or falters in its purpose, but carries out that fell purpose with a power of self-fulfilment that no science can defeat. It pursues the Irish people wheresoever they may go—in the slums of Scotch as well as the English cities. [*A laugh.*] No doubt, all this is very amusing to the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite. I am not alluding to the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), for I am glad to say that his good feeling renders him unable to participate in these jeers; but I repeat that Irish landlordism follows the Irish people even into the slums of English and Scotch cities, down in the depths of British mines, into the hotels of America, along the sheep-walks of Australia—wherever you go, you find that Irish men and Irish women are poor, and must remain poor, because they are endeavouring to help their fathers, their mothers, and their brethren at home who are trying to fill the maelstrom of rack rents. Does it lie in the mouths of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who have only been able to maintain their position by the American dollars of Irish servant girls, to turn round and attack hon. Members sitting on these Benches because our people in America have subscribed money in order that they may kill the vulture which has fed upon their vitals. I will now pass to the subject of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not think the noble Lord, with his experience of the past, can have been very much surprised that the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) should have made his language the subject of a definite Motion. Even reformed rakes, when they get upon the Treasury Bench, must remember the stormy passages of their Parliamentary youth. The noble Lord has always been challenging us to make his speech the subject of a definite Motion. Only the other night the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, thinking that he has done enough in explaining away the language of the noble Lord, has come to the conclusion that a more bellicose attitude is necessary, and has made it a matter of reproach to my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) that he has not had the courage of his convictions, and has not made the action and language of the noble Lord the subject of a definite Motion. And yet, when the challenge is accepted, and the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) shows that he has the courage of his convictions, and brings the language and acts of the noble Lord before the House as the subject of a definite Resolution, the noble Lord runs away. The noble Lord must be aware that he has supplied us with many precedents, and I am sorry to think that it will be our duty to study the speeches of the noble Lord during the next six months with the utmost care, in order to see whether they "point a moral or adorn a tale." On the 6th of February, 1884, the noble Lord, I find, took the serious step of moving the adjournment of the House. Probably the noble Lord may forget the fact. In fact, in those days the noble Lord moved the adjournment of the House so often that he may well fail to remember any particular occasion on which he did so. But it does not require frequent Motions for the adjournment of the House to make a large breach of the decorum usually observed in it, and to task very considerably the patience of this Assembly. Of this, however, there can be no question—that the noble Lord moved the adjournment of the House at least as frequently as any other Member. I do not know whether the noble Lord recollects the particular instance to which I am about to refer or not; but why did he move the adjournment? What was the great cause that induced the noble Lord to adopt this rather extraordinary Parliamentary course? It was that the night before the right hon. Gentleman who is now, I believe, the Governor of the Province of Madras (Mr. Bourke) had made a speech, and that nobody on the opposite side had got up to make a reply. The noble Lord, with all the breadth of language of which he is so great a master, commented upon the scandal, the indecorum, and the indelicacy of allowing an important Member of the Front Opposition Bench to get up and make a speech, and nobody on the Treasury Bench rising to make a reply. Yet last night the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), who is at present leading the Liberal Party, got up and made a speech directly impugning the conduct of the noble Lord, arraigning his acts, and giving quotations from his speech, in a manner which imperatively called for an answer, and yet the noble Lord sat glued to his seat, and had neither the decorum, nor the politeness and courtesy, in accordance with the immemorial traditions of the House, to rise in his place and to make even an attempt to reply. A direct Motion is now submitted to the House by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), and we challenge a vote. The noble Lord describes the course we take as Obstruction. I accept the noble Lord as a very high authority on Obstruction. In Obstruction he lived, moved, and had his being for many years. Obstruction was the ladder on which he climbed to power. It was the means by which he obtained political position, and, to a large extent, forfeited political reputation. At that time I supported the noble Lord, and I recollect a great deal of what the noble Lord did. We hunted in couples in past years. I myself am very heartily ashamed of the memory; and I hope the noble Lord is too. I have sat with the noble Lord in this House for some years, and I have carefully observed the course he has pursued. I have seen the noble Lord employ methods in this Assembly which I think even an Irish rebel would shrink from taking. I can remember—who can forget who was in the House at the time—the terrible strain there was when this country and the Empire of Russia were disputing over the Frontier of Afghanistan. Those days were days of anxiety, and in the possible consequence they were only contemplated with horror by every humane and reasonable man. We saw ourselves on the point of being involved in a contest with the most colossal Empire of the world—a contest which would have led to the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives, and have brought about one of the most terrible tragedies in the annals of war. What did the noble Lord, in such circumstances, do? Instead of being impressed by the danger of his country and the imminent prospect of finding her involved in all the horrors of a gigantic war, he stood up night after night, from his seat below the Gangway, and endeavoured, by every means in his power, to embarrass and thwart the Government in their efforts to preserve peace, and to make political profit out of their difficulties. Therefore, I am not surprised at the course which the noble Lord took in Belfast. More than that, Sir; when at last the time came, and the Prime Minister was able to announce, with that perfect consistency and honour, the Government had been able to save the Empire from the horrors of war, the comment of the noble Lord was that it was "terrible news." [*Cries of* "Question!" *and* "Order!"]

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I rise to Order. I wish to know from you, Sir, whether the remarks which the hon. Gentleman is now making have any reference to the Amendment before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. Member is replying to a charge of Obstruction made against himself and against hon. Members sitting with him, and I must say that he is entitled to reply to that charge. At the same time, the illustration which the hon. Member is employing seems to be somewhat long. I must remind the hon. Member and the House that the subject before us is the speeches of the noble Lord and hon. Members who are impugned in the two Amendments now under discussion.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I must admit that my illustration is somewhat long, and I will not pursue it further. The recollection of the words to which I have alluded is fresh in the public memory; it lives in the public memory, and it is one that will never be forgotten. I am not surprised at the conduct of the noble Lord in Belfast, although I confess that I was surprised when I heard of it first. An hon. Friend of mine told me that the noble Lord had only acted as was to have been expected, having in his early career been so much in our favour. At one time it appeared that there were only two things upon which the noble Lord entertained any strong feeling—namely, his hatred of Jingoism and his sympathy for the National League of Ireland. At length, however, it was said that he had turned so much against us that he had declared his intention of going to Ireland and arousing the Orangemen of the North against us. When I heard that announcement I was so innocent that I believed it impossible. I thought the noble Lord incapable of taking such a course; but I confess now that he more than realized the prophecy. What was the object of the speeches at Belfast delivered by the noble Lord and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson)? I think I can tell you. Their object was to create as much disturbance in the North of Ireland as would make the English people go away with the idea that Home Rule could not be granted without causing a civil war in Ireland. Those objects were not always openly avowed; but you will find that there was a journalistic revelation of their purport very soon after the delivery of the speeches themselves. On the 10th of August *The Times* informed its readers that a large share of the responsibility must fall on the mass of Protestants in the North of Ireland; that at that moment they were practically triumphant; that the danger of Home Rule, which would have swept the Protestants of Ulster out of the Dominion of Ireland and placed the Government in the hands of Mr. Parnell and Archbishop Walsh, had passed away; that there could no longer be any mistake about the feeling of the Ulster Protestants; and that it was clear now that their strength consisted in sitting still and waiting for the results—that is to say, that these riots have carried out the purpose of deluding the people of this country into the belief that Home Rule means civil war, and, that having been proved to the satisfaction of the public, murder and plunder might take a rest and sit still, and that the English public might wait. What was the character of these riots? I think they must have been a revelation to English Gentlemen. I do not think that anybody could have supposed it possible that in the 19th century men calling themselves Christians could murder one another in the name of religion. You must go to the Mussulman to find anything like the intolerance, bigotry, and murderous ferocity exhibited in the streets of Belfast, where Orange workmen were found pelting bolts of iron at a poor boy while drowning.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Gentleman that the question of the Belfast riots has already been discussed and decided by a vote of the House.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I will not continue that subject. I was only endeavouring to point out what was the effect of the language of the noble Lord; but I will not pursue the argument further. It was only an illustration of the cruelty and horror of the transactions which the speeches and language of the noble Lord had brought about. In the face of scenes like these, I wonder at the hon. Member who dares to speak of the courage of the Orange rioters of Belfast. I am the more filled with wonder and astonishment at the language which has been used by the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), who, having denounced the Orange Leaders, now sits on the Liberal Benches in order that he may the better defend the Orange cause. What must have been the effect on the people of Ireland of language and conduct such as that of the noble Lord. The noble Lord goes to Ireland, and the first thing he does is to revive religious bigotry, to stir up the embers of religious hatred, and to give a certain section of the population there to understand that, although they may murder and plunder their Catholic fellow-countrymen, the arm and strength of England will be behind them. What more atrocious gospel, more damaging to the honour of England and to the power of both England and Ireland, can be preached? You teach the Irish people that, under certain circumstances, they are perfectly free to plunder and murder, because the strength of England will be behind them while they are doing so. Can you not see that by this method of teaching you are giving every Irishman a reason for hating and detesting your rule, and, if possible, for rebelling against it? We have been lately discussing a good deal —at least, in the papers—the attitude of Russia and Bulgaria; but the very journals which are always talking about the evil results which would attend the establishment of Russian rule in Bulgaria are the first to encourage the noble Lord in a policy of coercing Ireland, and not only of dividing that country, but of actually supporting a portion of her people in rebellion, if a certain state of things should be brought about by legal and Constitutional means. I maintain that any man who propounds a policy like that in Ireland is doing more to make English rule hateful and detested than any rebellion could, and far more than can be done by American dollars. The noble Lord filled the Office of Secretary of State for India only last year. He knows very well that the only defence of our rule in India is that it keeps rival races and sects from cutting each other's throats. And yet, immediately the noble Lord retires from the Office of Secretary of State for India, with the experience he must have acquired of the ferocity of racial and religious differences, he goes to Ireland to reverse the policy of England in India, and to make the people fall foul of each other's throats, when, without his intervention, they would be able to live at peace. Talk about the disintegration and dismemberment of the Empire! Such a policy will best be carried out by fomenting religious animosities and arousing the worst passions of mankind. I think the words and acts of the noble Lord have done more to estrange the people of England and Ireland than almost any occurrence which has taken place within the last few years. The worst enemy of England in Chicago and elsewhere could not do more to sow the seeds of hatred in Ireland than the language of the noble Lord; and I hope the House to-night by its vote—at least, this side of the House—will show its detestation of such a way of bringing shame, dishonour, and danger upon England.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put.

The House *divided* ;—Ayes 119; Noes 202: Majority 83.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, J.
Barry, J.
Bickford-Smith, W.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blane, A.
Borlase, W. C.
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Commins, A.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly, L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Crilly, D.
Crossley, E.
Dillon, J.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. G.
Esslemont, P.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gill, T. P.
Harcourt, rt. hon. Sir W. G. V. V.
Harrington, E.
Harris, M.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Hunter, W. A.
Jordan, J.
Kelly, B.
Kenny, M. J.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Leamy, E.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lyell, L.
M'Arthur, W. A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Mayne, T.
Molloy, B. C.
Morgan, O. V.
Morley, rt. hon. J.
Morley, A.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Kerry)
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
Parnell, C. S.
Pickard, B.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Portman, hon. E. B.
Power, P. J.
Power, R.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Rountree, J.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, E. R.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Sheil, E.
Shirley, W. S.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.

Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watson, T.
Williams, A. J.
Williamson, J.
Williamson, S.
Wright, C.

TELLERS.
Labouchere, H.
O'Connor, T. P.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baden-Powell, G. S.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, H.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beach, W. W. B.
Beadel, W. J.
Beckett, E. W.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brookfield, Col. A. M.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burghley, Lord
Campbell, J. A.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Commerell, Adml. Sir J. E.
Compton, F.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Cranborne, Viscount
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Cubitt, right hon. G.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Egerton, hn. A. J. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Feilden, Lt.-Gen. R. J.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Finch, G. H.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fulton, J. F.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Gibson, J. G.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Gray, C. W.
Grimston, Viscount
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, General Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Hardcastle, F.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hoare, S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J. M.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knowles, L.
Kynoch, G.
Lambert, I. C.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Legh, T. W.
Lethbridge, Sir R.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclure, J. W.
Macnaghten, E.
Mallock, R.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Admiral R. C.
More, R. J.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Murdoch, C. T.
Noble, W.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Percy, Lord A. M.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Powell, F. S.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Reed, H. B.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Round, J.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Smith-Barry, A. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Theobald, J.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Verdin, R.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
Weymouth, Viscount
White, J. B.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wilson, Sir S.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

BURMAH—THE BRITISH AUTHORITIES—MILITARY EXECUTIONS—THE PROVOST MARSHAL.

RESOLUTION.

Dr. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): After many hours spent in recriminations that may not bear much practical fruit, I feel some reluctance to trespass on the time of the House; but the subject I am about to refer to is of importance in the cause of humanity and good government. This evening I asked a Question regarding the administration of law in Upper Burmah, and the Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John

Gorst) returned an answer which I am certain, from the well-known disposition of kindliness which he has always displayed towards subject races, could only have been prompted by imperfect information. I desire to call the attention of the House to this subject, and I therefore avail myself of this the sole opportunity afforded me by the discussion on the Address; and I shall say what I have to say as briefly as possible. The hon. and learned Gentleman could not bring himself to believe the statements embodied in my Question. I should have been equally incredulous as to the truth of the allegations on which I founded my query. In January last a report came to this country that the Provost Marshal in Mandalay was an ardent photographer, and had photographed Native prisoners in the moment of being executed. I asked a Question on the subject, and on the day I asked the Question another report was telegraphed home to the effect that the same Provost Marshal had, in order to extort evidence, had a man blindfolded, drawn up a firing party before him, threatened him with execution, but told him that his life would be spared if he disclosed the particulars of some conspiracy he was supposed to be connected with. The Secretary of State for India stated that he could not conceive the possibility of any British officer acting in such a manner, but he did what, under the circumstances, I think, was most creditable of him—he telegraphed to India for information. He not only telegraphed to the Governor General, but went out of his way and telegraphed to the Chief Commissioner in Upper Burmah. The result was that he received a report to the effect that the charge made against the Provost Marshal of having used the threat of execution as a means to extort evidence was well-founded. A few days afterwards the correspondent of *The Times* telegraphed home that the investigation that had been ordered into the case was a mere farce, that a number of civilians who had witnessed the photographing at the execution had not been called in, and that an attempt was being made to whitewash the Provost Marshal. He stated that the charge of having tried to extort evidence under threat of execution, it had been attempted to explain away; but that it had been officially reported that a man had been sentenced to death, but had been promised his life if he would only reveal what he knew of a certain conspiracy. But that turned out to be untrue, because the Chief Civil Officer said that no sentence of death could have been carried out unless he had given his consent. Further investigation was ordered by the Viceroy, and all the charges made by *The Times* correspondent, incredible as they appeared, were substantiated. With the news announcing this fact was also sent the information that the Provost Marshal would be reprimanded, and would be deprived of the promotion he had earned. The Governor General did not think that sufficient punishment, and the Secretary of State agreed with his view. The Provost Marshal was court-martialled, and the result has been that he has been publicly reprimanded, and has had to tender his resignation. The statement contained in my recent Question I made from correspondence I received from a gentleman whom I have every reason to believe well-informed, but who desires, for certain reasons, that his name shall not be disclosed. What he says on the subject is this. That at present a very bad state of things prevails in Mandalay—

"The Deputy Commissioner of Mandalay is a Captain Adamson, late of the Artillery. He has had no legal training, and possesses but little legal knowledge. He has, however, uncontrolled power. His decisions are not subject either to appeal or review. Captain Adamson tries prisoners in secret at his own house. In such circumstances it is an absolute impossibility for prisoners to produce witnesses in their own defence, or to secure a fair trial. Punishments of terrible severity are inflicted by Captain Adamson. I am convinced that I am within the mark in stating that Captain Adamson has within the last three months inflicted on prisoners sentences of transportation or rigorous imprisonment amounting in the aggregate to 3,000 years, besides which several men were shot and innumerable floggings of frightful severity inflicted. I cannot give the exact figures, as the Government refuse all information."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN (Kent, Isle of Thanet): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman, but I could not catch the name of the writer of this communication. Would the hon. Member kindly repeat it?

DR. CAMERON: I explained that he gave reasons why he wished his name to remain a secret. If the hon. and gallant Gentleman will be patient for a moment, I will give him another authority, and this time I shall be able mention a name. This informant I have quoted says that such feeling as to maladministration has been excited amongst the inhabitants of Mandalay, that it contributes very much to the disaffection that prevails in Upper Burmah. Since I sent in my Question an hon. Member has called my attention to the fact that, in *The Times* of the 17th of last month, very similar statements were made. *The Times*' correspondent sends home a letter in which he states, after having referred to the way in which justice is administered—

> "The discontent caused by such a state of affairs is deep and wide-spread, and extends to all classes. The discontent in Mandalay reacts on the whole of Upper Burmah, and encourages the people to resist to the very last."

He goes on to say that a Mr. Miller, who is assistant manager of the Irrawaddy Flotilla Company, having seen a letter of his in *The Times* of the 19th of May, had sent him a communication, of which he gives an extract. Mr. Miller, who, as I said, is connected with the management of the Irrawaddy Flotilla Company—and here we have a name for the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel King-Harman)—writes as follows :—

> "It was with considerable interest that I read the Mandalay correspondence in the London *Times* of the 19th ultimo ; and though during our mutual stay in Mandalay you and I saw affairs from two entirely different standpoints, I believe that every paragraph of your letter can safely challenge contradiction."

He goes on to say that the high-handed and illegal proceedings of the local authorities in Mandalay—

> "Are giving the name of British administration an unsavoury odour in the nostrils of peaceable and law-abiding citizens."

After giving a number of cases of oppression and extortion on the part of the police, he refers to the administration of justice in Mandalay, and to the manner in which prisoners are tried and convicted, and he quotes the following case :—

> "As an instance of the nature of the evidence on which suspects are condemned, I give you the following :—An elderly man, father of a large family, and universally respected in the quarter where he resides, is accosted in his own house by two men, who request him to read a document which they have brought. He reads half-way through, and sees that it purports to be a revolutionary message from a rebel Prince. He asks the men to go away and not mix him up with such matters. They leave, and are afterwards arrested with the letter on their persons. On being questioned as to the place where they were at last, they mentioned the name and house of the man who had partly read the letter for them. For this crime —and a European police officer, who was present at his trial, has assured me that such was the head and front of his offending—this man has been condemned to five years' rigorous imprisonment."

Dr. Cameron

Mr. Miller adds that he is aware that this sentence

> "Has shaken the faith of a large and influential section in Mandalay in English justice."

The Times' correspondent goes on to say—

> "A report has recently obtained wide currency among the Burmese in Mandalay, that prisoners tried before Captain Adamson have been beaten to compel them to give testimony. This report is probably unfounded, but, unfortunately, owing to the manner in which these trials have been conducted, it is impossible to convince the Burmese that the story is false."

I forgot to mention, when alluding to the case of the old man who was condemned to five years' imprisonment, that *The Times*' correspondent, referring to the matter, said—

> "Mr. Miller has assured me that he has ascertained from reliable Burmese witnesses, that it lasted only for the 'chewing of a betel'—*i.e.*, less than five minutes."

The House will observe that a previous letter which appeared in *The Times* was alluded to. Well, I looked it up, and I found that a long list of cases of maladministration of justice was given. He says that at the time the Viceroy visited Mandalay, the people were smiling and contented, and willing to accept British rule ; but that soon after they became discontented. He points out that a large portion of Mandalay was burnt down by incendiaries, and that an order was issued that no house should be rebuilt without the consent of the Deputy Commissioner. Of course, this order made the whole town useless, and it must have occupied the whole of the time of the Deputy Commissioner for months to consider applications, and give permission to people to build houses, and for months there must have been this large population without houses, and unable to build them, and, of course, driven to desperate courses and into disloyalty. It must be evident to the Under Secretary of State for India that any maladministration of justice must have the worst possible effect on the Native mind. The Earl of Dufferin is perfectly well aware of that, and one of his most earnest instructions to the authorities at Mandalay was that justice should be administered with scrupulous care. He says, in his Memorandum dated the 25th of February, 1886—

> ". . . it is our first duty to protect the peaceable inhabitants of the country from injury and wrong. For some time past martial law, which for a short period was the only alternative, has been superseded by the authority of the civil magistrate."

He says—

> "I understand that under no circumstances have any penalties been inflicted except at the instance of our civil officers. This rule should be steadily adhered to, and great pains should be taken to administer justice in such a manner as will stand the test of searching public criticism."

I ask can the administration of law in Mandalay be said to be fairly conducted if it is such as I have described?—if, as was admitted by the Under Secretary of State (Sir John Gorst), it is conducted in the private house of this gentleman who is not a lawyer, and conducted obviously against the law of the country, seeing that that law gives the right of appeal? Can that be said to be an administration of justice

> "In such a manner as will stand the test of searching public criticism?"

The Times' correspondent, in one of his letters which I have read since I put my Question, says that if the state of things is so bad in Captain Adamson's Court—which is the best conducted—it must be ten thousand times worse in the others. The men who preside over them have no legal training. In some cases he mentions telegraph clerks have been appointed as Judges. In one case he says—[*Cries of* "Divide!"] If hon. Members are impatient I can postpone these observations until to-morrow by moving the adjournment of the debate. This is a very important matter, and a quarter of an hour will be much better spent over it than in wrangling like a set of old women over the question of who is to blame for wasting time. As I say, *The Times'* correspondent declares that this Court of Captain Adamson is by far the best conducted in the country. Again and again he repeats the charge that the trials are conducted illegally, and that they are conducted without the right of appeal which was given by the law which came into operation in February last. He says the Burmese police have been taken over wholesale, and he says that many of them are extremely corrupt; in fact, he gives an instance reported in a Rangoon paper where an officer whose pay was 500 rupees a-month in the course of a few months accumulated 5,000 rupees. The grossest corruption prevails, it is said. I do not state any of these things on my own authority. I know nothing about them. ["Hear, hear!"] I say I know nothing about them; but neither did I know anything personally about the charges which I brought against the Provost Marshal, and yet those charges turned out to be true. I maintain that the authority upon which I bring forward these charges of maladministration of justice is quite as good as that upon which I founded my previous accusations. I do not wish to make any charge against Captain Adamson, of whom I know no more than I do about Colonel Hooper. I do not say that the charges against Captain Adamson are by any means as grave as those I had to bring against the other officer I have mentioned. He is a military man, and it will be admitted that the Military Profession is hardly a good school for judicial training. A man whose experience is confined to procedure in courts martial is likely to bring drumhead procedure with him on to the Bench. I invite the hon. and learned Gentleman to demand information from India on this subject, and to see that it is set forth in such a form as will enable us to test the accuracy of the statements made by the correspondent of *The Times*, whose name I am not in a position to state. It seems that this officer has to dispose of both civil and criminal cases. Let us know how many men have been tried; how many have been shot; let us know how many have been imprisoned, and what were the terms of imprisonment; how many have been flogged, and the number of lashes given; let us know also if there is any confirmation of the story that an old man was sentenced to five years' imprisonment. I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman not to make a defence of this official, but to telegraph to Mandalay for this information. In times past the hon. and learned Gentleman has been one of the strongest in advocating justice for Native races; and I ask him to do now what he has so often urged upon those in Office—namely, to ask for information.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): Sir, I hope the House and the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) will forgive me if I make a very short reply to the Question which has been put on this subject. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that not only is Her Majesty's Government willing to make full inquiry as to the administration of criminal justice in Upper Burmah, but that it was making such inquiries for many weeks before this question came forward. I think the hon. Member ought to bear in mind that to reduce a semi-barbarous country, like Burmah, which has been so long under the rule of a Sovereign like Theebaw, to a condition in which justice is satisfactorily administered, is not a very easy task, and one which requires a great deal of forbearance and prudence. In the answer which I gave to the hon. Member at the beginning of the proceedings this evening, I had no intention, and I know there is no intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to shrink from any inquiry into the charges that have been made; but I think it only right to state that Captain Adamson is not only a military man, but an officer of 15 years' standing in the Civil Service of the Indian Government, and that I think he ought to be protected against the vague charges made by the hon. Member and in a letter from *The Times*' correspondent. Captain Adamson, so far from not having had legal training, was for seven years Assistant Magistrate at Rangoon, and for about eight years he served in a similar position in Lower Burmah; he was selected by the Viceroy, over other officers, as the most fit person, from his knowledge of the language and his training in the duties of a Judge, to hold the very important position of Deputy Commissioner at Mandalay, and in that position he has had to exercise very severe criminal jurisdiction. The hon. Member says there was no appeal allowed in Upper Burmah. Well, Sir, there is no right of appeal there. *The Times*' correspondent says there was the right of appeal; but my information from the Viceroy is, that at that time the Government of Burmah was despotic; that the only law was the will of the Crown, and that there was no appeal from Criminal Courts during the period of transition.

DR. CAMERON: I wish to point out that, in February or March, the Indian Code was extended to Upper Burmah, and that in Lower Burmah the right of appeal exists.

SIR JOHN GORST: The hon. Member is wrong. Until the 26th of February, the country was governed by the will of the Monarch of this country. On that day it was united by Proclamation to British India; but at the same time a Resolution was passed by the Viceroy of India in Council, under the Act of 33 *Vict.* c. 3, s. 1, which had the effect of preventing the laws of British India from extending to the newly-acquired country. I am quite aware that *The Times*' correspondent says that there was the right of appeal; but in that respect, as in many others, his statement is quite inaccurate. I do not wish to follow the hon. Member into the various allegations which he has made, and I will not now test the accuracy of Mr. Miller or of *The Times*' correspondent; if I were to do so, I might make some observations which might show that their authority is not so great as the hon. Member seems to suppose. But I say that no specific case shall be brought before the Secretary of State for India which shall not be inquired into. With regard to the story which Mr. Miller told, of an old man who was committed to prison for five years, I may say that, at present, until names are given, the Chief Commissioner in Upper Burmah is unable to identify the particular case with any case of which he has record; but the hon. Member must bear in mind that since *The Times*' correspondent wrote there has been no time to communicate with Mandalay, except by telegraph. Finally, I beg to assure the House that Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the necessity of making the administration of criminal justice in Upper Burmah above all reproach, of subjecting it to searching criticism, and that no effort will be spared to arrive at the truth.

DR. CLARK (Caithness): I wish to call the attention of the Lord Advocate

(Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) and the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) to the state of affairs in Scotland.

MR. SPEAKER: I point out that the subject is not relevant to the Question before the House.

DR. CAMERON: I should have withdrawn my Motion; but, as I think the promise of the hon. and learned Gentleman is not sufficiently distinct, I feel it my duty to divide the House upon the Question.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 81; Noes 192: Majority 111.—(Div. List, No. 12.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Address."

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—ADMINISTRATION.—RESOLUTION.

DR. CLARK (Caithness): Sir, I regret that I am compelled to bring some facts before the House on which I propose to move an Amendment regarding the administration of justice in Scotland. I bring these facts before the House because I cannot do it in Committee of Supply, all the Estimates regarding Law and Justice in Scotland being passed. I desire to call the attention of the Lord Advocate and the Secretary for Scotland to past administration, and to bring some cases before them which require to be looked into. The first case I would bring before them is one that occurred in my own county, where four men were kept imprisoned for 66 days, without being tried, for what I believe to have been an imaginary offence, so far as they were concerned. The men have been liberated now and will not be tried. The facts are as follows:—In the middle of December there were two fires—two corn stacks were burnt down in the county—and the Procurator Fiscal called—as is done in Scotland—secretly before him a number of individuals. The offence, as I say, was burning down two stacks, and the following is an example of the questions that were asked these prisoners—these men who suffered 66 days' imprisonment without being tried, and were only liberated when I called the attention of the Lord Advocate to the case, and was going to move the adjournment of the House to bring the case before the House—then the Lord Advocate wired down to the Fiscal to either try these men or liberate them, and this Fiscal, knowing that the trial would be a trial of himself, preferred in March to liberate the men, though they had been in prison from the month of December. These men have never been tried. Two of them were the only support of an aged mother, who, during their imprisonment, suffered very cruelly; and the families of the other two also suffered. The following, I say, is an example of the questions aske din private of the accused:—

"You are accused of burning down corn stacks. How many political meetings have you attended?

"Answer: Four.

"Have you attended any private political meetings?

"Answer: None.

"Did Dr. Clark promise you anything?

"Answer: No.

"Did he promise you three acres and cow for your vote?

"Answer: No.

"Were you, James Stephens, engaged in taking the horses from Dr. Clark's carriage on the way to the school-house?"

[*Cries of* "Order"] I perhaps may have to give hon. Gentlemen an opportunity of going through the Lobbies again.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Gentleman pursue his remarks?

DR. CLARK: The question was put—

"Were you, James Stephens, engaged in taking the horses from Dr. Clark's carriage on the way to the school-house?

"Answer: Yes.

"And did you help to put the piper in the carriage?

"Answer: I did.

"Were your boys there?

"Answer: They were.

"Did Dr. Clark pay you well for it?

"Answer: I never received any payment for it."

These are a few of the questions that were put to the men who were accused of burning down two corn stacks, and they are very pertinent to the Question, as the House will see. The result was that the men have suffered over two months' imprisonment. They are now at home, and there is now another individual about to be tried, and that is the Procurator Fiscal. I trust that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate will cause an investigation into this case, and some of the other cases to which his attention will be drawn. I may say that the Procurator Fiscal is, of course, a factor and agent for a large landed proprietor in the county, on whose land there is a stone quarry, the men employed at which have their wages calculated every three months—the month after the third month they are paid, after an amount is deducted for the meal and corn and other things they have received. These latter facts will be information to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, who was going to investigate our truck system in Scotland. I may point out that the quarry is worked by gentlemen, one of whom is a member of a firm of practising solicitors in Thurso, and that the son of that gentleman's partner in the legal firm was my opponent at the last Election. That is the reason these men were questioned in the way I have described. Since these men were released a subscription has been got up for them in the county, and of the subscribers I am glad to say I have been one. This Procurator Fiscal also flew at higher game. There is a respectable man in Thurso who has served Her Majesty for 30 years and has retired with the rank of Surgeon General. He committed the crime of being chairman of my committee in a certain district, and he was also brought before the Fiscal and insulted by him. But if the Government inquire into all these facts they will find that these corn stacks were insured a few days before the fire, and investigation amongst the farm servants who built these stacks will elicit the fact that they were put up damp, and were neither fit for man nor beast. And they will probably find that the amount paid by the Insurance Company as the value of the stacks was much more than they would have realized if taken into market. This Procurator Fiscal took the opportunity of bullying this gentleman I have mentioned, and of keeping James Stephens, who was my deputy chairman in that district, and his son, in prison for 66 days. I hope there will be another trial in regard to this matter. The late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) ordered that these men should either be released or tried. I trust that the Government will bring about a trial, so that we may know what the facts of the case are. I should also like to call the attention of the Government to the conduct of a Sheriff and a Fiscal in a neighbouring town, and I would also express a desire that these gentlemen should be tried. They have been tried before the Court of Session, and the judgment of the Sheriff has been overturned. I would call attention to the summing-up of the Judge, who condemned a friend of mine, a venerable clergyman, for whom I have great respect, to four days' imprisonment. This gentleman was sent to prison, thrust into a cell, and compelled to wear prison garb. And for what? Why, according to the summing-up of the Judge, the Rev. Mr. Arnold had criminally committed this offence — he had addressed questions at a political meeting which were never in the slightest degree invited. This was at a meeting where a Conservative gentleman was wooing the constituency, a gentleman who had got a very good hearing, although three-fourths of the meeting were Liberals. This gentleman was asking questions; but a few people who were there, especially the local Tory leader, refused to allow him, and put him down and accused him of rioting. A Tory Procurator Fiscal and a Tory Judge, instead of trying the members of their own Party, who unwarrantably interfered with this gentleman in the exercise of his undoubted right to put questions at the meeting, made an unfortunate victim of this gentleman and sentenced him to four days' imprisonment. What, I say, was the summing up of this Judge—this Arcadian Judge? He said this rev. gentleman had put questions which were never in the slightest degree invited; and I daresay hon. Members opposite have found during their election campaigns that questions have been put to them which have never been in the slightest degree invited. But, unfortunately, hon. Members have not had Judges in their districts prepared to send people to prison for putting such questions—for "heckling," as we call it in Scotland. The Judge said one of the questions this rev. gentleman had put was—"Are you going to support the obstructive Conservatives?" And he (the Judge) had said no Member in the House of Commons would allow himself to be called an Obstructive, and there was no Member who would not feel insulted if asked, when putting up for a constituency, whether he was going to support the obstructive Conservatives. In fact, said the Judge, it was very offensive; and he went on to say that the next question was precisely in the same tone, and was also meant to be offensive, for it was—"Are you to represent us or misrepresent us?" The Judge held that the asking of such a question was a direct insult, and that the observation could not be regarded as a question. He further stated that the result of the conduct of this rev. gentleman was to put a stop to the meeting, because, instead of putting questions, he had exercised the privilege by saying insulting things, or otherwise saying what he must have known was calculated to be insulting to those who were holding the meeting. As I say, this rev. gentleman was sentenced to four days' imprisonment; but the sentence, on an appeal to the Court of Session, was overturned, and the conduct of this Judge—this honest Judge, who was not at all a partizan—was characterized as it ought to be characterized. I desire to bring another case before the House. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] I will now bring two cases before the House for the sake of the hon. and gallant Colonel opposite who interrupts me. The first has reference to a well-known Sheriff, whose conduct has already been twice brought before the House. I am going to bring to light some new facts with regard to him. Probably we shall very soon have marines and gunboats in the Isle of Skye; the man who has been demanding them is Sheriff Ivory, of Inverness, to whom I am now referring. I submit that in the Isle of Skye things are not what they ought to be, and that there is a reckless spirit growing up amongst the people; but one of the factors producing that state of things is the conduct of Sheriff Ivory and other Sheriffs of the county. I have four affidavits here—I will not trouble the House by reading them—but they are made by four respectable gentlemen, or rather by three gentlemen and a lady. I know them all. One of the gentlemen is the postmaster at Portree, which is the capital of Skye; another is a large merchant in that town; another is his clerk; one is a carpenter and boatbuilder of the town; and a clothier and draper, who happened to be in the post office when the Sheriff entered and began to bully the lady who was acting as post office clerk, and to demand that she should commit a crime. He would commit a crime and wanted another to aid him. How can you expect, when the Chief Judge of a county commits crime with impunity, entering people's houses for the purpose, and when evidence to that effect is brought before the Lord Advocate and nothing is done, in fact, that the criminal is screened—how, I say, can you expect that the people of Skye will have much respect for the operation of the Civil Law there? This Sheriff had an impression that one of the lawyers there, who was a Sheriff Clerk Deputy, was favourable to the crofter cause; and he thought that some telegrams sent to Portree would be useful in establishing a case against this gentleman; and he wanted to compel this lady of whom I have spoken to hand him over the telegrams, and when the postmaster came in he tried the same thing on with him. That is a crime—we in Scotland call it a crime—for committing which a man is liable to be imprisoned for two years. The law against telegrams being made known had been violated, and when my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) called the attention of the House to the affidavits I have mentioned, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) said the Sheriff told a different story. Now, we had the sworn evidence of the postmaster, a clerk, and of two tradesmen who were in the office at the time, and yet the late Lord Advocate thought it was of no importance because the Sheriff had told a different story. But since the Sheriff told his story we have got official evidence of the man's crime in the Report he has made to the Commissioners of Supply of the county. In that Report the Sheriff publishes to the world the telegrams which he illegally obtained. I am sorry to say that he was aided and abetted by a Post Office official named Leatham, who ought also to be severely punished. We have got these facts in the evidence of witnesses, and we have got them demonstrated by the official Report which has been laid on the Table of the House, and which has been brought before the Crown Authorities. There is, therefore, no doubt that Sheriff

Ivory committed this crime; but I suppose we shall be told again that after all this Sheriff is universally respected. I should like to know how it can be expected that anyone will respect Sheriff Ivory after his conduct in this matter? I hope the authorities will try Sheriff Ivory also for the crimes he has committed. Unfortunately, the laws in Scotland are different to those in England and Ireland. We would save the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) the trouble of investigating these matters if we could have a criminal trial as we could have in England. While the right hon. Gentleman shields criminals——

Mr. SPEAKER: The expression the hon. Gentleman has used is not a proper one to use in this House, and he must withdraw it.

Dr. CLARK: I beg to withdraw the expression, and to apologize for using it. May I also call attention to the conduct of my own Sheriff?

Mr. ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to ask you whether the hon. Member is permitted to waste the time of the House by relating what appears to me matters which have nothing to do with the Address?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no power to interfere.

Dr. CLARK: I desire, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman what I believe to be illegal acts on the part of the Sheriff of Caithness. I may have been mistaken, but I was always under the impression that under the 51st clause of the Ballot Act, a candidate at a Parliamentary Election had a right to be present at the counting of the votes. The Ballot Act applies to England as well as to Scotland, and in England it has been decided that candidates have the right to be present when the votes recorded are being counted. I presented myself at the Sheriff's Court, but the Sheriff refused to allow me to be admitted. I retired to look up the Act and to consult with my agent. I returned to the Court, and told the policeman who refused to admit me that I was going in, and if he prevented me I would have him pulled up for assault. He called his sergeant, who assured me he had instructions from the Sheriff to keep me out. I know some of the hon. Gentlemen opposite sympathize with illegal acts. Let me mention a few more of such acts committed by my Sheriff. Candidates are compelled to deposit a certain sum of money, and Returning Officers are by law compelled to send in their bills within a certain day, otherwise they are barred. My Returning Officer sent in his bill five days after date, and it was accordingly barred. My agent committed an illegal act by condoning the matter. Ten days afterwards the Sheriff sent in another bill, but I was not to be caught napping—I refused to pay it. If the Sheriff had liked he might have applied to the High Court to get the matter rectified, but he simply kept my money until Parliament ended.

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you if the hon. Gentleman is in Order in relating the circumstances of his Election contest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not out of Order; but it is quite obvious he is taxing the patience of the House.

Dr. CLARK: I regret that I should tax the patience of some hon. Members in bringing before the House what are, undoubtedly, illegal acts on the part of very important officials in the Highlands of Scotland. At the present time, a spirit of lawlessness is abroad in Scotland, and as Sheriffs are as much infected with it as crofters I think I must still tax the patience of some hon. Gentlemen by bringing other facts before the House. In this case the Sheriff acted in a way he ought not to have acted—he acted illegally. I have one more fact regarding the administration of justice for the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour). In 1884 we in the Highlands got circulars inciting to crime. We brought these circulars before the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour). My friend the late Member for Argyllshire (Mr. Macfarlane) on the 17th of July, 1884, called attention in the House to the character of the literature. The Lord Advocate said that he would make inquiry. The same circular was read two nights ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour). I thought I had seen or heard of it before, and when I asked the right hon. Gentleman whose circular it was——

Mr. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to rise to Order. I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you do not consider the hon. Gentleman is trifling with the time of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said I have no power to interfere with the hon. Member.

Dr. CLARK: When I asked whose circular it was, the right hon. Gentleman said I knew something about it.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): I did not say anything of the kind.

Dr. CLARK: I called out who circulated it, and the right hon. Gentleman said—"Perhaps you know best," and there was great laughter on the other side of the House. I do not want to trespass any further on the patience of hon. Gentlemen. I agree with them that we ought not to transact such Business between 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning; and I hope that, by-and-bye, we shall be found adjourning each night at half-past 12. I will conclude by moving, as an Amendment to the Address—

> "And humbly to represent to Your Majesty that there is pressing need for reform in the administration of law in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland."

I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland will consider these matters. During the ensuing winter there will probably be trouble in these districts of Scotland. If writs are issued in the Island of Skye, probably there will be more gunboats and marines required there. I hope that anyone who breaks the law, be he either crofter or cottar, Fiscal or Sheriff, will be punished; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will see that Fiscals and Sheriffs as well as crofters and cottars are tried if they do wrong. And the right hon. Gentleman might also, at the same time, see that when the Judges are in Session they ought not to make political speeches, especially regarding prisoners who are awaiting trial.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): At this hour (1.15) I do not intend to detain the House at any length; but, inasmuch as the hon. Member (Dr. Clark) has thought proper in the course of his observations to make serious accusations against gentlemen in responsible positions, I think it is right I should say a word or two before the House deals with the matter. The hon. Member spoke of a case in which two men had been detained in prison for a period of 66 days without trial, and he suggested that they were so detained out of spite on the part of a Tory Procurator Fiscal. The hon. Member is quite mistaken in supposing that any such thing is possible, and for this simple reason, that no one can be detained in prison after commitment by the Sheriff except under the orders of the Crown Counsel, and during the whole time these men remained in prison the Crown Counsel were the representatives of the Party who sit opposite. The hon. Member has also called attention to a number of questions which are said to have been put by the Procurator Fiscal to these men. If such questions were put in the course of an official examination, I have no hesitation in saying they constitute a gross breach and dereliction of duty on the part of the Procurator Fiscal, and, certainly, if the questions appear in the official declaration, they must call for serious deprecation. In the meantime I do not think it is possible they can appear in the official declaration. As regards the case to which the hon. Member refers, and in which a rev. gentleman was sentenced to four days' imprisonment, I have nothing further to say except this, that it was brought up by way of appeal, and justice done as far as it could be done by the rev. gentleman being liberated within 24 hours, and by the sentence being set aside by the Superior Court. If the rev. gentleman had any ground for accusing any person of having acted maliciously, he had the ordinary remedy under the Civil Law. As regards the case of which we have heard so often, the case of the inspection of certain telegrams in the Island of Skye, I do not know the exact facts so as to be able to give any opinion as to whether the Sheriff acted with perfect discretion in the matter or not; but I think it should be distinctly understood by this House, as the opinion of the Law Officers of Scotland, that where it is necessary for the preservation of the public peace, and for the purpose of preventing justice being defeated, a Sheriff of a county would be perfectly entitled to stop the sending of telegrams inciting the people to create disturbance and to resist the law. In my opinion, a Sheriff would be entitled to go a great deal further; he would even be entitled to cut the wires. Whatever the Rules of the Post Office may be, the Sheriff, in the exercise of his judgment, is entitled in a case of public disturbance to deal with the telegraph wires as may be necessary for the purpose of preventing justice being obstructed by any person who attempts to use them for the purpose. That is my distinct opinion. Then as regards the statement of the hon. Member (Dr. Clark) that he and his friends are placed in a difficulty in Scotland in consequence of prosecutions being taken at the instance of the Public Prosecutor, he is in that respect entirely mistaken, because if he or any of his friends think they can sustain a criminal prosecution, they are perfectly entitled to endeavour to do so, provided they have any substantial interest in the charge brought. The Public Prosecutor cannot refuse his concurrence in any case in which the private prosecutor thinks he has cause of complaint. Aspersions have been cast upon the administration of justice in Scotland; but while it is open to any person to prosecute if the Public Prosecutor will not take up the case, so satisfied are the general public of Scotland that all cases that ought to be prosecuted are only prosecuted by the Crown, that during the whole course of my professional experience I have never known one case of private prosecution. Now, Sir, in reference to the counting of votes and to the hon. Member (Dr. Clark) being excluded from the room, I am rather inclined to think that if the manner and tone of the hon. Member were pretty much the same as we have seen him occasionally adopt in this House——

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. and learned Gentleman is not entitled to use that expression, and I hope he will withdraw it.

THE LORD ADVOCATE: I withdraw it, Sir; I had no intention of speaking offensively. I will only say that if the hon. Member felt he had cause of complaint he should have complained at the time and in a proper Court. He was perfectly entitled to have the matter brought up at the proper time. As he did not choose to bring it up then, I maintain it should not be brought up now. Lastly, Sir, with regard to the question of the Returning Officer of Caithness having acted illegally in the matter of expenses, surely that is a matter concerning which the hon. Gentleman had a civil remedy. Apparently he was advised he had not so good a case as to justify him in taking advantage of the remedy the law provided.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I desire to say a few words on one branch of the subject introduced by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark), and in doing so I trust it will not be thought I am wasting the time of the House. The hon. Gentleman referred to the matter of private inquiry, and it is to that matter I wish to refer. I wish to do so as the victim myself of mal-administration of justice in this respect; but in order that I may not be misunderstood, permit me to say that I approve of the system of private inquiry where a person charged with an offence may have the power of exculpating himself if he desires to do so. I believe if the system had been generally adopted, it would not have been necessary for the Home Secretary to have exercised his power as he did on many late occasions when, after the confession of the criminals, many innocent persons were released from prison. I desire, by way of illustration, to cite to the House my own experience of a private inquiry, and to point out how injustice may be done to an individual by the tyranny and bullying and the overbearing manner of the magistrates who are employed to carry on the inquiries. A few years ago I was summoned to appear before an inquiry held in Cork to state what I knew concerning most horrible transactions—namely, the blowing up of public buildings by dynamite, and the taking of the lives of Her Majesty's subjects. I attended before the secret inquiry, but I laid it down, as a condition to answering any questions, that I would not be asked any that had no bearing on the matter set forth in the summons. The magistrate got very wrath indeed, and endeavoured to bully me out of my decision. I was firm, however, and I told him that on no account would I recede from the position I had taken up. I would answer no questions unless I understood from him that he would confine himself to the matter set forth in the summons.

He endeavoured by threats of imprisonment, and by every system of bullying he could employ, to compel me to be sworn. I declined to be sworn unless I got the assurance I asked, and he accordingly sent me to prison. I remained in gaol a week, and when I again appeared before the inquiry the same system, though to a more severe extent, was adopted towards me. The magistrate seemed to have worked up his anger to an extraordinary pitch because, when I appeared before him the second time, he could scarcely conceal his anger. He actually sat there with a revolver in his hand, and many hours he kept me before him, and by threats and every other means he could employ tried to get me to recede from my position. I declined to do so, and a second time he sent me to prison; and I think if it had not been for the intervention of my Friends on these Benches, the same magistrate would have continued to send me to prison week after week. I merely relate these circumstances to show that there is much reason in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark). It may be asked why I declined to be questioned as to matters not specified in the summons. I did so because I knew that already there had been summoned before the magistrate no less than 200 young men, each of whom had been examined upon his whole life. According to the terms of the Act under which they were summoned, they were bound, if they once allowed themselves to be sworn, to answer every question the magistrate thought fit to put to them under the pain of a penalty of six months' imprisonment. The administration of justice is a very serious matter, and if you increase the power of your magistrates, it is a duty incumbent upon the Government to see that the magistrates are fit and proper persons to exercise stringent powers. I do not oppose it—certainly if it be proposed, and if I have the honour of a seat in this House, I should not oppose the introduction of a measure that would give power for secret inquiry. I believe it would be of benefit to the people charged. I believe that the whole presumption of English law, as it stands at present, is wrong on the subject. I hold and maintain that if you increase the power of magistrates, you must be exceedingly careful as to the character of the men you employ to exercise the power. It is for that reason I rise to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Caithness—it is to impress upon this House that there is much reason in what the hon. Gentleman has said; it is to impress on the Government that wherever these powers exist—and I believe they do exist in Scotland—the Government should be careful the powers are exercised by judicious and responsible persons.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's Co., Ossory): A matter of great public importance was raised by the remarks of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald). I understood him to say that, according to the law in Scotland, under certain circumstances which he described it was possible for telegrams to be inspected by a Sheriff, by virtue of his own authority, and possible even for a Sheriff to cut the wires. Now, I want to know whether that is really the law in Scotland, or the law in England, or the law in Ireland, for it does not seem to me it ought to be the law in any civilized country in a state of peace? For this reason I most earnestly support the Amendment of the hon. Member (Dr. Clark).

[The Amendment being informal, was not put.]

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee on the said Address," put, and *agreed to.*

To be communicated by Privy Councillors.

SUPPLY.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I beg to move—"That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): Will the right hon. Gentleman say in what order it is proposed by the Government to take the Estimates on Monday next?

MR. W. H. SMITH: My noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) stated, earlier in the evening, that the Army Estimates will be taken first, then the Navy Estimates, and then the Civil Service Estimates in their regular order.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Will they all be put down for Monday?

MR. W. H. SMITH: No; only the Navy Estimates.

Motion *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House will, upon *Monday* next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[Estimates referred].

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, That this House will, upon *Monday* next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): On behalf of my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) I wish to give Notice that he will, on Monday, move that Mr. Courtney do take the Chair.

SECRET SERVICE (REPEAL) BILL.

Mr. Jackson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Akers-Douglas)

[BILL 41.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. RAIKES in the Chair]

Clause 1 (Short title).

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): Mr. Raikes, we have had no explanation from the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) as to the exact nature of this Bill. The Bill has been brought in in pursuance of some arrangement; but it has some features in regard with which we ought to receive an explanation from the hon. Gentleman. In the first place, it is proposed by this measure to repeal a section and a portion of a section of two separate Acts of Parliament. The Auditor General, who has made a Report to this House, and in accordance with which Report the Bill is brought in, says that he has come to the conclusion that he is unable, in reference to the Secret Service Vote, to fulfil the statutory obligation imposed upon him. Now, Sir, I should like to know——

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member will be more in Order if he makes his observations on the 2nd clause of the Bill, which has reference to the sections to be repealed. The 1st clause merely relates to the title.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Repeal of parts of 22 Geo. III. c. 82, and 1 & 2 Vict. c. 2).

MR. M. J. KENNY: I merely desire to have some statement from the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) in regard to the reasons for the sudden discovery of the Auditor General that he is unable any longer to fulfil the duty imposed upon him by the 26 & 27 *Vict.* The declaration which the Auditor General was required to make was of an extremely explicit nature. Amongst other things, he was to declare that none of the Secret Service money was spent in Election matters. We are perfectly aware, from recent disclosures, that a portion of the Secret Service Fund, payable out of the Civil List, has, for many years past, been devoted to the purpose of securing the election of Gentlemen to this House, and therefore I think we are entitled to an explanation from the Secretary to the Treasury as to how it is that the conscience of the Auditor General has been so suddenly pricked that he can no longer make the declaration required of him. For years past he must have suspected that the declaration he made was not in accordance with the facts, and it appears to me that, if he had reason to doubt the truth of what he said, the making of the declaration was very like the committal of perjury. I await explanation from the Secretary to the Treasury, or from the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Akers-Douglas), both of whom are present, and either of whom will, I suppose, be able to afford me the information I ask.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I do not think it is necessary to occupy the time of the House in making any explanation with regard to this Bill, though, of course, we are perfectly willing to explain anything that may require explanation in connection with it. I may say that the hon. Member (Mr. Kenny) is entirely wrong in supposing that the Bill was brought in in consequence of any difficulty the Auditor General had, because, as the hon. Gentleman knows, the Auditor General really had no power over the money dealt with by this Bill. The £10,000 which has been the subject of a great deal of controversy from time to time was a charge upon the Consolidated Fund, and for a long series of years was used for various purposes by successive Patronage Secretaries to the Treasury. It is only fair to my hon. Friend and Colleague (Mr. Akers-Douglas) to say that it was in consequence of his action and of his very strong feeling that this money ought to be made the subject of Parliamentary control that this Bill was introduced. My hon. Friend was the first man who surrendered the unexpended balances, and I think he is entitled to the credit of this Bill. As I have already said, I am not aware it is necessary to make any explanation. I should have thought the House would have been very glad to get rid of the difficulty. I have no doubt the Bill will meet with the hearty approval of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), who I am sorry not to see in his place, but who has always taken a great interest in the Secret Service Fund. It is because the Government have recognized the fact that there is a growing wish that the control of Parliament over the Expenditure of the country should be more complete that they have brought in this Bill. The House will understand, of course, that there are some messengers whose salaries will have to be paid. To meet such salaries a Supplementary Vote, amounting, I think, to about £1,100, will be brought in.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I must confess that, as far as I am personally concerned, I regard the introduction of this Bill with very great satisfaction; and I think credit is due to the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Akers-Douglas) for initiating the improvement. I cannot, however, altogether agree with the statement which has fallen from the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), to the effect that the Comptroller and Auditor General had nothing to do with causing some such measure to be introduced, because the hon. Member will know very well that, besides the £10,000 which has year after year been drawn from the Consolidated Fund, and which, being drawn, was beyond the ken and reach of the Comptroller and Auditor General, there was another sum, amounting sometimes to £33,000 in a single year, drawn from the Votes of Supply for the same service. In regard to that larger grant, it appears there is somewhere about £100,000 unaccounted for. The Comptroller and Auditor General had no authority to demand certificates such as he was entitled to receive from voted Services; and it was by reason of the fact that he complained of the inability to check matters in this respect that attention was drawn to the subject, and that year after year the Public Accounts Committee made Reports which were of such cogency and strength that the Treasury were obliged to take the matter in hand. With regard to the matter of unexpended balances, it appears to me that the present Bill is insufficient. I do not find in the Bill, certainly not in the clause now under discussion, which is the operative portion of the Bill, any direction for the surrender of any unexpended balances which may be at present in the hands of the Secretary to the Treasury. I do not understand how, having regard to the wording of the Act of Parliament under which the Comptroller and Auditor General is to act, he would be able to insist upon a statement or certificate in regard to the money which is now in the hands of the Secretary to the Treasury. I merely throw this out as a suggestion, and possibly the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jackson) may see his way to amend the Bill so as to remove the difficulty. If the difficulty is not removed, I imagine the Comptroller and Auditor General will be in precisely the same difficulty he has been in in past years. I imagine it will be necessery to introduce some Amendments. I am not prepared to suggest the Amendments; but the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jackson) may possibly be in a position to do so.

MR. JACKSON: I may be allowed to answer that Question; perhaps I ought to have done so before. It was not thought necessary to insert any clause in the Bill bearing upon the subject; but the Bill, as the hon. Member is aware, is made to come into operation immediately on its being passed into law. He may, and I have no doubt the House will, accept the assurance of the Government that any unexpended balances will be properly accounted for.

Clause *agreed to.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

Mr. JACKSON: As I do not anticipate there will be any objection on the part of hon. Members to take the third reading of the Bill now, I beg to move that the Bill be now read the third time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 6*th September*, 1886.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill — *First Reading*— Secret Service (Repeal) * (15).

Provisional Order Bills—*First Reading* — Electric Lighting * (13).

Second Reading—Local Government (No. 7) * (3); Local Government (No. 8) * (4); Local Government (No. 9) * (5); Local Government (No. 10) * (6); Local Government (No. 11) * (7); Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2) * (8).

Committee — Local Government (Highways) * (168); Local Government (No. 5) * (172).

Committee — Report — Local Government (Poor Law) (No. 7) * (169); Local Government (County Divisions) * (167); Local Government (Gas) * (189); Local Government (No. 3) * (170); Local Government (No. 6) * (190); Pier and Harbour * (191); Tramways (No. 1) * (192).

MALTA—THE DOCKYARDS—EMPLOYMENT OF MALTESE SUBJECTS.

POSTPONEMENT OF QUESTION.

Earl DE LA WARR, who had on the Paper a Question to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether there are any special Orders or Regulations relative to the employment of Maltese subjects of Her Majesty in the Dockyards at Malta or otherwise as seamen in the Royal Navy; and also, Whether there is any objection to laying Papers on that subject upon the Table of the House? said, that that as no Member of Her Majesty's Government was present, he would postpone asking the Question till Thursday next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 6*th September*, 1886.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —Army Estimates, Votes 2 to 9, & 11

Provisional Order Bills—*Third Reading* — Elementary Education Confirmation (Birmingham) * [272]; Elementary Education Confirmation (London) * [273], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—CONSTABLE MALONE.

Mr. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a report of the proceedings in the Summons Court at Belfast, in *The Belfast Echo* of August the 28th, referring to the charge preferred by District Inspector Leatham against Constable Malone of attempting to rescue a prisoner; whether Constable Malone was fined forty shillings and costs; and, whether the Government intend to take any further steps in the matter?

Mr. McCARTAN (Down, S.) said, that before the right hon. and learned Gentleman answered the Question he wished to ask him, Whether he was aware that on the trial several witnesses swore that Constable Malone did not attempt to rescue the prisoner; whether the decision was only that of the majority of the Bench; whether Constable Malone had given notice of appeal, and whether the case was still *sub judice?*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): I have read the report referred to in the Question. It is the fact that Constable Malone was fined 40*s.* for neglect of duty in allowing a prisoner to escape. From this decision he has appealed, and pending such appeal no final decision can be arrived at; but, as is usual in such cases, he is for the present suspended from duty. In answer to the Question of the hon. Member for South Down, it is obvious that as the matter is still *sub judice* it is not desirable to go into any discussion of the case.

TRADE AND COMMERCE—COMMERCIAL EDUCATION.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to a letter to *The Times* newspaper of the 25th on the inadequacy of commercial training in this Country; and, whether, considering the stress laid upon it in the various communications addressed to the Foreign Office respecting diplomatic and consular assistance to trade, he will inquire, in conjunction with the heads of other departments, into the possibility of establishing some recognised centre of commercial education with proper tests of efficiency?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead) (who replied) said: I understand the Question of the hon. Member to point to the expediency of creating one or more purely commercial schools in which special commercial training is to be given. The hon. Member is well aware that in the existing schools many subjects are taught which will be of service in commercial life; and I may add that the Charity Commissioners have, in some schemes under the Endowed Schools Act, made special provisions for the teaching of such subjects, as in the Realschulen in Germany. No question of having purely commercial schools has yet been raised before the Education Department, and I should hesitate to offer any opinion upon the matter until some well-defined scheme is submitted. The hon. Member will doubtless consider whether the question could be usefully brought under the consideration of the Royal Commission now sitting on education.

ARMY (IRELAND) — CAVALRY REGIMENT AT DUNDALK.

MR. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, If the Cavalry regiment at present stationed in Dundalk is to be removed in the near future; if so, by what regiment is it to be replaced, and at about what date is it proposed to make the contemplated change?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): No, Sir; I am informed that there is no intention of moving the Cavalry regiment at Dundalk.

CHINA—SMUGGLING IN CHINA—THE CHEFOO AGREEMENT, CLAUSE 9.

MR. RICHARD (Merthyr Tydvil) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Joint-Commission, appointed by the Governments of Great Britain and China, in pursuance of Clause 9 of the Additional Article to the Chefoo Agreement, "to inquire into the question of the prevention of smuggling into China from Hong Kong," has arrived at any conclusion; whether it is true that the Chinese Commissioner has made a proposition which is objected to by the British Government; and, whether the Chinese Government possess the right to appoint Consuls to reside in Hong Kong in the enjoyment of rights and privileges such as are enjoyed by British Consuls in the treaty ports in China?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Joint Commission is still sitting, and Her Majesty's Government have no report as yet of what has taken place in it. China does not possess the right under existing Treaties to appoint Consuls in any part of Her Majesty's Dominions.

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—CIRCUIT COURTS.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Lord Advocate, If the attention of the Government has been called to the inconvenience and expense of holding unnecessary Circuit Courts in Scotland; and, whether the Government intend to deal with the subject next Session?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities), in reply, said, that some years ago—he thought in 1881—in consequence of complaints that prisoners were detained too long before trial, additional Circuits were ordered to be held in Scotland. They were only held when there were cases making a Circuit necessary. He was not aware that in the case of the ordinary Circuit

Courts there were more maiden Circuits in Scotland than in other parts of the United Kingdom. It was not to be forgotten, moreover, that at these Courts the public had opportunities of bringing up certain classes of civil appeal, and also of making complaints against local Judges. If the Circuit Courts were less in number, the effect would be to curtail these privileges.

ARMY—7TH HUSSARS—SUICIDE OF A SERGEANT.

MR. MACDONALD CAMERON (Wick, &c.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether an inquiry has been held into the questions raised at the recent inquest on the death of a sergeant of the 7th Hussars from suicide, as affecting the conduct of an Officer in that regiment; and, whether the result of such inquiry will be made public, and when?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes, Sir; a searching inquiry has been held. After carefully reading the evidence I am satisfied that there are no grounds for the imputation of tyrannical conduct which the Coroner's jury thought fit to make against Lieutenant Carew. That officer, who has the character of being strict, but just, is entirely exonerated from the charge of having acted harshly towards the deceased. On the other hand, the evidence shows that the deceased was an inefficient sergeant, and that there were serious irregularities in his accounts. It is proved that he was addicted to drink, that he was in an irritable state of mind, and that not long before his death he complained of his head. The conclusion arrived at by the Military Authorities is that the suicide was the result of excitement caused by the unsatisfactory state of his accounts.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE VETERINARY SURGEONSHIP.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) (for Mr. DWYER GRAY) (Dublin, St Stephen's Green) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any appointment has yet been made to the vacant Veterinary Surgeonship to the Royal Irish Constabulary; whether a rule has been made restricting the selection to Retired Army Veterinary Surgeons, and thus excluding all the regular Veterinary Surgeons practising in Dublin; whether men retired on pension are presumably incapacitated in some degree, either through age or infirmity; whether men who have gone through a regular training in the veterinary art on the modern system are not subjected to much more severe tests as to qualification than were in force when any man who is now a Retired Army Veterinary Surgeon became qualified; and, whether the Government will reconsider the rule referred to?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary has requested me to answer this Question. No appointment has yet been made to the vacant Veterinary Surgeonship to the Royal Irish Constabulary. Although I believe this appointment has been hitherto held by a retired Army veterinary surgeon, I understand that there is no rule restricting it to that class. The whole matter of the appointment is at present under the consideration of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary; and I think I can say that he will not allow any consideration or practice to prevent the selection of a thoroughly competent and efficient person.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS ON LORD CLANRICARDE'S ESTATE, CO. GALWAY.

MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true, as stated in the press, that the cost of evicting six families on Lord Clanricarde's property in Galway has cost £10,000, of which the taxpayers of the United Kingdom will have to pay £6,000; whether that sum would have bought the fee simple of the evicted lands many times over; what is the sum due to the landlord by these six tenants, for the non-payment of which they have been evicted at such cost; and, how much of the expense will be borne by the landlord?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: It is impossible to estimate with anything like approximate accuracy the cost of carrying out the evictions referred to; and Her Majesty's Government is not aware of the amount due to the landlord; but it may be taken that the cost of carrying out the evictions was much in excess of the amount due. It is obvious, however, that the Government cannot be governed, when called on to assist in enforcing legal process, by the proportion which the cost of doing so bears to the amount recovered.

ISLANDS OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC—H.M.S. "DIAMOND"—REPRISALS ON NATIVES.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he has yet received the official report of the Captain of H.M.S. *Diamond,* with reference to reprisals inflicted by her towards the close of last year upon the natives of Normanby Island, Hoopiron Bay, Mullport Bay, Norana Island, and other places in the Western Pacific, concerning which questions were addressed in this House to the then Under Secretary for the Colonies and Secretary to the Admiralty, on the 15th of March and 20th of May last respectively; and, whether, if received, he will lay the report upon the Table of the House?

MR. RICHARD (Merthyr Tydvil) said, he desired, before that Question was answered, to put another relating to the same subject. He wished to know whether the noble Lord was aware that in 1869 Lord Clarendon addressed a despatch to Sir Rutherford Alcock stating that Her Majesty could not allow her naval officers or Consuls to demand reparation for wrongs done, nor to determine whether coercion should be applied by blockade, reprisals, or landing armed men? His Lordship pointed out that all such proceedings bore the character of acts of war, and that Her Majesty's Government could not delegate to Her Majesty's servants in foreign places the power of involving their country in war. He also wished to know whether Lord Granville, writing in 1880, to our Consul on the West Coast of Africa, said—

> "I have to observe that Her Majesty's Government will deeply deplore"——

MR. SPEAKER: As far as I can gather the terms of the Question they rather exceed the limits of ordinary Questions.

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I must ask the hon. Gentleman to postpone that Question, in order that I may have some time to obtain information on the subject. In reply to the hon. Member for Glasgow, I have to state that the Report in question was forwarded by the Commander-in-Chief on the Australian Station in his letter of April 2 last, received at the Admiralty on May 24, and a copy was furnished to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on June 3. There will be no objection to give the Report in question.

ISLANDS OF THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC—ISLAND OF MALAYTA—H.M.S. "OPAL"—REPRISALS ON NATIVES.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to a statement to the effect that H.M.S. *Opal,* having shelled a village in the Island of Malayta, as a punishment for an attempt made by the Natives to seize the *Dick,* a schooner engaged in "recruiting" labourers, proceeded to Lendara Island, and demanded of the Natives the surrender of the murderers of Captain Home and his mate, who were murdered in January of last year; if he can inform the House whether it is true, as stated, that, although the village had been shelled three months after the murder, because the murderers were not then given up, H.M.S. *Opal* again shelled the place, and landed a company of seamen to destroy every thing they could find; and, whether he will lay Papers relating to the operations of the *Opal* before Parliament?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I am indebted to the hon. Member for having sent me the information on which he based his Question. We have no official Report; but we know that the *Opal* is engaged in investigating certain alleged outrages. That Report will come home; but I cannot undertake to lay it on the Table until I see it.

LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND)—DEATH BY DROWNING OF DONALD MACNAB.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been called to the circumstances under which Donald MacNab, boatman, met his death on Loch Awe, on the night of June 27th or morning of June 28th; and, whether, considering the fact that his body was not found where his companions in the boat at the time of the occurrence alleged that he had fallen overboard, and that, when found floating weeks afterwards, it bore marks on the head and hand, and, considering the anxiety of MacNab's family to have the case investigated, he will direct the procurator fiscal to order such post mortem examination as may show whether the marks referred to had been caused before or after death, or, if such an examination has been made, he will allow MacNab's family to inspect the medical report and any depositions in the case?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities), in reply, said, that Donald MacNab was drowned on the morning of June 28, and those who were with him in the boat gave information at once to the police. The body was not recovered until the 22nd of August, and was, of course, in an advanced state of decomposition, and had been injured, from being in that state. It was examined by a competent medical man, who reported that there was no sign of any injury having been inflicted before death. It was not the practice to make public the particulars in cases where those responsible for criminal investigation were satisfied that no crime had been committed; but he might mention, for the satisfaction of the hon. Member and those on whose behalf the Question was put, that on recovery of the body what was observed tended strongly to confirm the accuracy of the statements which had been made at the time by those who were with the deceased when the accident took place.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—LAUNCESTON BOARD OF GUARDIANS—EDUCATION OF CHILDREN IN A PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

MR. BORLASE (Cornwall, St. Austell) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he can give any information as to a difference which is said to have arisen between the Local Government Board and the Launceston Board of Guardians in respect of the appointment of a schoolmistress?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The Guardians of the Launceston Union, in the early part of last year, informed the Board that they proposed to dispense with the services of the workhouse schoolmistress, and to send the children to a public elementary school at a distance of about half-a-mile from the workhouse. With regard to the care of the children when out of school hours, it was stated that a pauper inmate would have the charge of both the boys and girls and sleep in their bed rooms, and that an inmate of the workhouse would accompany them to and from school. The Board are so strongly impressed with the evils which result from the close communication of the children with adult pauper inmates of the workhouse that they stated that they could only assent to the arrangement as to the children going out to school instead of being under the charge of a teacher in the workhouse on the condition that proper arrangements for a paid officer taking charge of them were made. The Guardians stated that the master and matron would undertake the care of the children; but the Board pointed out that as the master was the only male officer in the workhouse, and in addition to his ordinary duties had to undertake the supervision of paupers who are set to work on land belonging to the Guardians, and also to discharge the duties which ordinarily attach to the porter of the workhouse, it was impossible that he could give that attention to the children which was necessary, and the Board urged the Guardians to reconsider the question, with a view to the appointment either of a caretaker of the children or a porter, who could give that attention to the boys when in the workhouse which was of such importance to their future welfare. This communication was dated March 26 last; but the Board received no reply from the Guardians. Subsequently the auditor disallowed the payment of the school fees, amounting to 17*s.* 3*d.*, as the Board had not assented to the children being sent out to school. On an appeal from the guardians against the auditor's decision, the Board, pending the settlement of the question as to the charge of the children, stated that they saw no sufficient reason for remitting. There has never been the slightest indisposition on the part of the Board to assent to the children being sent out of the workhouse to school, provided proper arrangements are made for their supervision while out of school hours.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—INSPECTION OF WELSH SCHOOLS—INSPECTORS' REPORTS, 1884-5.

MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been drawn to the Report of the Chief Inspector of Schools in Wales for 1884-5, in which he twice expresses his regret that want of space compelled him reluctantly to omit information which his colleagues, at great trouble, supplied him respecting their own districts in Wales; whether, in the Report for 1885-6, no general Report of the inspection of Welsh schools appears; and, whether, considering the great value of Inspectors' Reports to teachers and school managers in Wales, he will direct that in future an annual Report of the inspection of Welsh schools, together with other information bearing on elementary education in Wales, be published separately?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The omission of any part of Wales from notice in the Report for 1885-6 is due to a change made two years ago, whereby, instead of the old system of Reports for a year by District Inspectors published at intervals of several years, the Chief Inspectors of five out of the ten divisions into which England and Wales are divided are annually required to draw up a Report with the assistance of the Suffragan Inspectors in each division reported upon. Thus each division, of which Wales is one, is reported upon once in two years. This plan supplies a more complete account of the state of education throughout the country, and at the same time gives a better basis for any inferences which may be drawn as to its progress, and I am not at present prepared to make any change in the direction suggested by the hon. Member. In reference to the omission of valuable information from the Report for 1884-5, I have to point out that, though Wales is one of the smallest divisions, the Report affecting the Principality is the largest but one of all those submitted in the course of the last two years, and is, in fact, largely in excess of the limit which it has been found desirable in most cases to impose.

NAVY (DOCKYARDS)—WORKS AT HAULBOWLINE.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the graving dock at present in course of construction at Haulbowline has been shortened considerably from what appears as the stated length on the original plan; and, if so, why was it shortened, and to what extent; whether the said dock at present being built will be capable of receiving first or second class ships of the Royal Navy; whether the expense entailed by the redressing of the stones being used in the construction of the graving dock was caused by the dock being shortened from the originally intended length; and, when the Government propose proceeding with the second graving dock that appears in the original plans and designs?

The FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The graving dock at Haulbowline is being carried out at the length shown in the original plan. There was an idea, since abandoned, in 1878 of making it longer, and some stone was procured for this purpose. It will take in first-class ships or any others of the Navy. The stones purchased for lengthening the dock have been re-dressed to suit other parts; but the employment of concrete has also obviated the use of stone in other portions of the dock. The construction of a second graving dock will depend upon whether experience shows such a dock to be necessary.

DR. TANNER asked whether the dock had not been shortened by 70 feet?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, it was intended to have been 478 feet in length, and it was now 410 feet.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) inquired whether a serious leakage had not been found in the dock, and whether it was not impossible to carry out the original plan?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, that last year a certain amount of leakage had been discovered in the dock; but he understood that it had been effectually remedied.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—SITTINGS OF COURT OF REVISION, CO. TYRONE.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether last year the Court of Revision for South Tyrone only held sittings in four places, *i.e.* Fintona, Clogher, Aughnacloy, and Moy; whether the revision for the Polling District of Ballygawley was held at Aughnacloy, five miles distant, and the revision for the Polling District of Castlecaulfield at Moy, also five miles distant; whether application has this year been made to the Lord Lieutenant, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by the 36th Vic. c. 2, s. 3, to order a Court of Revision to be also held at Ballygawley and Castlecaulfield; and, whether it is intended to comply with this application?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): As to the first two paragraphs of the Question of the hon. Gentleman, I have to reply in the affirmative. An application was made to the Lord Lieutenant towards the end of last month asking that an order should be made for holding Courts of Revision at Ballygawley, Castlecaulfield, Fivemiletown, and Caledon; but it was received too late to make any change this year. It will, however, be carefully considered before next year's revision.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS—COUNTING AND DECLARING THE VOTES.

MR. BAUMANN (Camberwell, Peckham) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether persons admitted to the counting of votes at School Board elections are allowed to publish details of the voting beyond those given by the returning officer in his declaration of the result?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The orders of the Education Department regulating School Board elections put in force the provisions of Section 4 of the Ballot Act, by which such conduct is expressly prohibited.

THE CURRENCY—APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION.

MR. MONTAGU (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether a Royal Commission will be appointed to consider the silver question; whether, if such a Commission be appointed, it will also inquire into the unsatisfactory condition of the gold, silver, and copper now in circulation; and, whether the scope of the said Commission will include the consideration as to the advisableness of facilitating commercial transactions and elementary education by introducing a decimal currency into this Country and India?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that Her Majesty's Government, having considered this matter with great care, have decided to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals. The Commission will not inquire into the unsatisfactory condition of the gold, silver, and copper now in circulation, nor will it be within the scope of the Commission to—

> "Include the consideration as to the advisableness ef facilitating commercial transactions and elementary education by introducing a decimal currency into this country and India."

The Government are distinctly of opinion that that is a very bold assumption, and that, so far from facilitating elementary education or commercial transactions, the introduction of a decimal coinage might have a directly contrary effect. I hope to be able to state in a day or two the names of the Commissioners, and to lay on the Table of the House to-night a Minute of the Treasury setting forth the causes of the appointment of the Commission and the terms of the reference regulating their inquiry.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—SITTINGS OF COURTS OF REVISION, CO. MONAGHAN.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is any rule based on population or area by which the places of holding of revision courts is determined by revising barristers in Ireland, and, if there be any rule or custom other than the convenience of the revising barristers themselves, why is it that only the revision courts are held in the Parliamentary

Division of North Monaghan, and that the electors of the Petty Sessions District of Emyvale and Scotstown, having about 1,500 and 900 voters respectively, have no courts held for them, and that the electors are obliged to travel from seven to thirteen miles to the court at Monaghan, with no Railway communication, and wait there during the revision, lasting ten or twelve days; and, whether anything can be done to remove the very considerable inconvenience and expense thus inflicted on the electors of those districts before the next approaching revision?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The places for holding Revision Courts are not determined by the revising barristers, but by the Lord Lieutenant in Council. In selecting the places the convenience of the electors and the suitability of the accommodation are carefully considered, regard also being had to the fact that every additional Court imposes an additional charge on the ratepayers. Careful inquiry was recently made as to the expediency of holding Revision Sessions at Emyvale and Scotstown. It appeared, however, that Monaghan, which is the market town of these districts, was probably the most convenient place for a large proportion of the voters residing therein; and as regards those at a greater distance, the Revising Barrister, by taking their cases first, was able to dispose of them on the first day of the Sessions. In any case, it is too late to make any change before the next revision.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked whether a Petition had not been presented in favour of holding a Court at Emyvale?

MR. HOLMES, in reply, said, that a Petition was presented to the late Lord Lieutenant some time in the month of July, signed by 30 or 40 persons; but, of course, where the voters numbered nearly 1,000 that number could hardly be said to represent the entire voters of the district.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—GIRVAN AND PORTPATRICK RAILWAY.

MR. HUGH ELLIOT (Ayrshire, N.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether he is aware that, in the month of May last, General Hutchinson, in a report to the Board of Trade, stated that a tunnel, a bridge, and certain viaducts, on the Girvan and Portpatrick Railway, were in need of repair "with the least possible delay;" and, whether these repairs have yet been effected by the Girvan and Portpatrick Railway Company, or whether the tunnel, bridge, and viaducts remain in the same condition as at the time of General Hutchinson's report?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I shall be happy, if the hon. Member wishes it, to furnish him with a copy of the Report he refers to. The Board of Trade are not aware whether the repairs recommended therein have been effected; but we are in communication on the subject with the Girvan and Portpatrick Railway Company, and also with the Glasgow and South-Western Railway Company, who worked the line until a recent date.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—IMPORTS FROM THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

MR. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether Her Majesty's Government contemplate prohibiting the landing of animals, or any specified kind thereof, or of carcases or other things within the Contagious Diseases Act, from the Dominion of Canada, or any part thereof, to any port or ports in the United Kingdom?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.) (who replied) said: I beg leave to answer the hon. Gentleman's Question in the negative.

ARMY—CHARGES AGAINST THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

COLONEL DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will endeavour to obtain the consent of Colonel Hope to the immediate publication of the strictures on the Ordnance Department, submitted by him to the Secretary of State?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Colonel Hope needs no invitation from me to publish his strictures on the Ordnance Department. So far as I am concerned he is quite at liberty to publish them.

ADMIRALTY—CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS ON BOARD TROOPSHIPS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, How many troopships at present have Catholic chaplains; whether it is the practice on board any of Her Majesty's ships for Catholics to attend the Service of the Protestant chaplains on Sundays, in cases when they have no opportunity of attending Mass on shore; whether, in cases where no Catholic chaplain is available, and the ships are not in port, prayers are read for the Catholics on board by a Catholic officer; whether it is still the case, as declared by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 27th March 1882, that there is no difficulty in providing accommodation for Catholic chaplains on board troopships; and whether, if so, seeing that the Channel Fleet is frequently not in port on Sundays, there is anything to prevent arrangements being made for a Catholic chaplain to accompany the Squadron, in conformity with the Admiralty Minute of the 7th June 1878; and, whether, if the Minute in question does not cover the case of the Channel Fleet, there would be any objection to extending its terms by a new Minute?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): None of the troopships bear Roman Catholic chaplains as "part complement." Their embarkation on each voyage is contingent on the number of Catholic soldiers taking passage; but, as a matter of fact, a Roman Catholic chaplain was embarked on each voyage of the Indian troopships last season. As stated in my reply of Friday last, it is not the practice for Roman Catholics on board Her Majesty's ships to attend the service of the Protestant chaplain. Prayers are frequently read to Catholics on board by Catholic officers. It is still the case that accommodation can be found for Catholic chaplains in troopships; but they are specially built to afford accommodation, which is not the case with fighting ships. The Channel Squadron is seldom long absent from ports where the services of a Roman Catholic priest cannot be obtained, and therefore the Minute of 1878 has not been applied hitherto to that squadron. I am anxious to facilitate, as far as I can, sailors in Her Majesty's Navy of all denominations obtaining, when at sea, the religious ministrations to which they have been accustomed; and any reasonable proposals having that object in view and coming from authorized quarters would be carefully considered. If the Channel Squadron were to be ordered on a cruise entailing a long absence from ports the Minute of 1878 would be applicable to such a case.

RAILWAYS (METROPOLIS)—BRIDGE ON THE NORTH LONDON LINE.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If his attention has been called to the condition of the Railway bridge of the North London Line, worked by the London and North Western Railway Company, in the Chalk Farm Road, St. Pancras; whether he is aware that the noise of the trains crossing it has caused several serious accidents, as well as being a nuisance to the neighbourhood; and, whether he will communicate with the North Western Railway Company, in order to do away with the nuisance, by altering the structure of the bridge?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The attention of the Board of Trade has not been called to the condition of the bridge mentioned by the hon. Member, and the Board of Trade are not aware that the noise of the trains crossing it has caused several serious accidents. The Board of Trade have communicated with the North London Railway Company, and their reply I shall be happy to show to the hon. Member.

ARMY (ARMY CLOTHING)—LIMERICK CLOTHING FACTORY.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether he is aware that a promise was given on 7th August 1885, by the then Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay), to the effect that, if the work of making up Army clothing can be done cheaper in Limerick than at the Government Establishment in Pimlico, "Limerick will not suffer at all;" whether this undertaking has not been carried out, though frequent representations have been made to the War Office on the matter; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the Minute made by Mr. Childers, when Secretary of State for War, after his visit to Limerick, with reference to the Army clothing factory in that city, and generally on the subject of Army clothing contracts; also Copy of a Letter addressed to the Secretary of State for War by Lord Carnarvon, when Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, having special reference to the desirability of giving continuous employment to the Army clothing factory in Limerick?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter), in reply, said, that the answer given on the date mentioned by Mr. Guy Dawnay was correctly quoted from *Hansard;* but it must be taken in connection with another answer given by him on the same evening. There would be an opportunity of raising the question that evening in Committee of Supply; and if it suited the hon. Gentleman's convenience, it would be better that he (Mr. Northcote) should make a full explanation later on as to the views of the Department. He might say now, however, that orders had been given during 1886 to the Auxiliary Forces Company for 153,500 garments, or nearly 500 garments daily. The Pimlico factory had, since August, 1885, been reduced by 334 hands, and was considerably below its authorized normal strength. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, he had to say that it was not usual to lay Departmental Minutes of this kind upon the Table of the House; and the Secretary of State did not think there was any occasion to depart from the usual practice.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) gave Notice that in consequence of the reply of the hon. Gentleman he would raise the whole question in Committee of Supply.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EMPLOYMENT OF GUNBOATS FOR CONVEYANCE OF LEGAL OFFICIALS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is a fact that one of Her Majesty's gunboats is to be used for the purpose of conveying the sheriff, military, and police to the Calf Islands, Castle Island, and M'Carthy's Island, where evictions are to be carried out; and, whether it is a fact that the late Government of Her Majesty refused to send a gunboat to the Island of Skye for a similar purpose?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The gunboats on the West Coast of Ireland are frequently employed in conveying various officials to and from the Islands and various places on the Coast, there being no regular means of communication. As regards the special case referred to in the Question, the Vice Admiral at Queenstown reports that "he knows nothing of the movements reported, and has given no orders on the subject." In reference to the last Question relating to Skye, although a large force of Marines was sent there, there is no record at the Admiralty of any official request having been made for a gunboat for that purpose.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given him private Notice—namely, Whether he can give the House any information with regard to the movements of Sir West Ridgway, and the probable date of the return of the British members of the Afghan Boundary Commission to India?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): The Commission will return to India as soon as necessary arrangements permit—certainly in the course of the present month; and Sir West Ridgway will confer with the Ameer of Afghanistan at Cabul on his way.

BULGARIA—REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Prince Alexander of Bulgaria has already abdicated or not; and, if he has done so, whether any and what steps have been taken with a view to the appointment of his successor?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): In answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question, I have to say that, as far as Her Majesty's Government have been informed, no act of abdication has been performed by Prince Alexander. With regard to the future, any arrangement can only, according to public law and International engagements, be made upon the basis of the Treaty of Berlin, which gives no separate or exclusive right to any one Power, and must, according to that instrument, depend upon the joint and consentient act of the signatories to that Treaty. Her Majesty's Government have no separate engagement, duties, or interests in Bulgaria. Their duties and engagements are taken in common with the Great Powers of Europe, and according to the Treaty of Berlin the assent of the Great Powers to the election of a Prince of Bulgaria must be unanimous. I think I ought to say that Her Majesty's Government had hoped much from the ability and great qualities of Prince Alexander. They deplore the treachery and violence by which his reign was interrupted, and they would hear with great regret that he has finally decided to abandon the work which he had undertaken.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): That is poor consolation.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked whether the Government were not prepared at the present crisis, which was a very serious one, to say a few firm words? [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Order!"]

[No reply.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I beg to move that Mr. Leonard Courtney do take the Chair.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Who is to put the Motion?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I understand the practice is that if anybody rises to speak on the Motion the Speaker will resume the Chair.

Mr. COURTNEY took the Chair.

(1.) £30,800, to complete the sum for Divine Service.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £17,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Administration of Military Law, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Upon this Vote I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) whether the War Office have considered the recommendations made to them in regard to the great advantage attending the improvement in the occupation of military prisoners in Brixton Prison; whether the industrial occupation did not result in a very satisfactory way; and whether effect will be given to the recommendation of the Military Authorities in favour of the extension of the system to other prisons?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I have not had the subject brought under my notice; and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) will, I am sure, understand that I have not been able, during the few weeks I have held Office, to read up all the Papers at the War Office. I will attend to the question he has mentioned.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: The point is, whether the practice of putting men who are only convicted of military offences should be put to baneful and lowering occupations should be continued; whether oakum picking, for instance, should be done away with, and something in the way of manufacturing occupation extended to all military prisons?

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £173,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Medical Establishments and Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

COLONEL DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn): I do not mean to stand long between the Committee and the Business of the evening; but this is a very important Vote, and I desire to enlist the sympathies of the Committee, quite irrespective of Party, on behalf of the Military Medical Department. It is within the knowledge of the Committee that that Department has gone through considerable changes during the last few years. In olden times the Army medical officer was a unit belonging to the regiment. It was a comfortable though expensive system, a system which had many advantages. I believe the men were better looked after. The medical officer in former days was more intimately acquainted with the constitutions of the men, and he was emphatically a friend among the officers. When we went on active service, however, the regimental system could not exist. The officers had to be worked as Departmental officers; and it was clear we must have the same system in times of peace as in times of war. There are many things one regrets in the old system—regrets having lost them; but it is far better to accept the inevitable, and do what we can to make the Army Medical Department even more efficient than it is. No efficient Department can be found in which there are distinct grievances; and I maintain that although successive Secretaries of State have done their best to remove the grievances of the Army Medical Department there are some yet remaining. There is a distinct grievance with respect to the proportion of home and foreign service. When the Department was formed it was assumed that every medical officer would have from one and a-half to two years at home to from three to five years abroad. That was based on on assumption which was absolutely wrong; it was a sort of arrangement which would suit the Millennium, but not the times in which we live. It is no use saying that the disturbance has been caused by the wars in which we have lately been engaged. We must always be prepared to find some small wars, which must disturb the best calculations. But every medical officer has, for every three years at home to serve, 12 years abroad. Such a proportion of foreign service is excessive, and it is more injurious to a medical officer than to others, because a medical officer ought to keep pace with the times, and with all great questions of surgical and medical science, and if he is kept away from home for so long he is sure to get more or less useless. Besides, to keep up efficiency in a Department the men must feel they are being treated justly. I, therefore, trust that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will take this distinct grievance into consideration, and do what he can to remedy it. It has become almost a chronic grievance, because the War Office has got in the habit of availing itself during times of war of the services of men who have retired from the Army Medical Department. From an economical point of view that is wise; but, at the same time, it is not wise to outrage the feelings of any Department. Again, we have a system of calling upon the medical officers to pass examinations. It is a right system, one which I trust will never be dropped; but we ought to give to medical officers the advantages we give to the combatant officers. It is the practice, under the present system, to give combatant officers who are about to undergo an examination leave and special facilities for study; but the medical officers receive no encouragement whatever. They may be at the other end of the world, and yet they are called upon to produce certificates. Under these disadvantages, assisted in no way by the State, they are called upon to pass examinations. I think that in the interest of the Service, as well as in justice to the medical officers, they should be allowed one or two months' leave in every six or seven years, in order to qualify themselves for the examinations they are called upon to pass. Again, there is another hardship which I believe they feel very keenly. Combatant officers who reach the rank of Lieutenant Colonel are relieved from further examination. The authorities know our capabilities, and, therefore, do not require us to be tested. But medical officers, even when they reach the higher ranks, are called upon to pass examinations. It is quite clear that when a medical officer has attained a certain rank his capacity for the different Services ought to be well known. Again, Sir, the question of hospitals is a point of great importance, not so much for the medical officers as for the country. A field hospital had to be sent out during the Nile Expedition. Orderlies were called from all the hospitals of the country, who had never worked together before. Men who had not been accustomed were put in charge of the hospital, and I was told by the officer in command that he had, in the face of the enemy, to teach the men how to pitch their tents. I think it would be better if, at our large stations, field hospitals were constantly standing, and men were being constantly trained in hospital work. I do not think this would cost anything. At all events, it is most important that it should be done, because we should then have a standing field hospital in readiness; besides which, the hospital might serve as a training school for the Volunteer Medical Staff Corps. We must remember that no nation in time of peace can keep up a Medical Staff sufficient for its wants in time of war. We must have men in reserve, and I think we shall find a good reserve in the Volunteer Medical Staff Corps. We live in a time when people look upon preventible pain as a crime; and, therefore, we ought to see that we are not obliged, as we have frequently been, to put men by the side of our sick and wounded soldiers who are unaccustomed to hospital work. I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) will consider these questions before the next Estimates are presented. It is a most desirable thing that a Department such as the Army Medical Department, which is doing so much to raise the feeling of *esprit de corps* in the Army, whose members have, in the field and in epidemics, shown courage worthy of all praise, should receive from us, as the Representatives of the nation, some recognition of the work they have done in the past, and some assurance that any grievance which they feel shall be removed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR '(Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): No one will take any exception to the criticism with which my hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Duncan) has brought forward the case of the medical officers. I fully agree with him in the view that the Army medical officers deserve the largest encouragement, and that anything the Secretary of State or the War Office can do for the Medical Service ought to be done. My hon. and gallant Friend asks me to do a great deal. I can only say I will examine carefully the statements he has made, and wherever I find a grievance use my best endeavours to remove it, and bring the Medical Staff to the condition which he desires it should attain. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has spoken of the large disproportion between the terms of home and foreign service. It is, no doubt, a fact that recently the foreign service of the Medical Staff has pressed hardly upon them; but I am glad to say that that has now been relaxed, and that the officers of the Medical Service who are next for duty abroad will only have two years and eight months' service abroad to one year of home service. My hon. and gallant Friend has also referred to the question of examinations, and of the facilities which should be afforded the medical officers to endeavour to qualify themselves for the discharge of their duties. These questions have been under the consideration of my Predecessor and myself; and the War Office will do everything in their power to secure for the medical officers that increased knowledge and skill which improved and developed science affords.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardineshire): I miss from the Estimates this year any Return showing the strength of the Medical Department in India. I should be glad if the Secretary of State for War could give the Committee any information on the subject. I have reason to believe that the proportion, as regards India, has been very much altered.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I thought that the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War to the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite would have given a full explanation of this Estimate. It appears to me that it still requires further explanation. I find, under Sub-head D, that there has been a notable increase in the pay of nurses and for miscellaneous labour, &c.—an increase from £8,000 to £15,000. Then, again, in Sub-head C, under the pay of Civil Medical Practitioners, there is also an increase of 25 per cent. Furthermore, under Sub-head F there is a sum of £1,400, which appears now as a new item in respect of payments to the Government of India for the Medical Staff serving on board troopships. All these very considerable increases appear to point to some distinct new departure, on the part of the Military Authorities, in regard to improved medical treatment in the Army. The right hon. Gentleman either forgot this point, or he has not yet been able to inform himself of its full significance. I hope he will be able to answer the question now. There is also another point on which I should like to put a question. Is it or is it not the fact that the medical officers at Netley Hospital are complaining of the insufficiency and inferiority of the food supplied to the Army, and that they attribute the lowness of vitality which has been observed to that cause?

MR. W. H. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): I think the hon. Gentleman is inaccurate, or that he has been misinformed in regard to the large increase in the cost of the Medical Department. There has been an increase in the pay of Militia surgeons. Referring to the Estimates I find there has been an increase in the pay of nurses, and on other heads, amounting to about £8,800 on a total Vote of £35,200. That is made up of an item of £5,000 on one head—of £1,300 for 11 nurses for Egypt, and £2,500 in the shape of Departmental pay for an addition to the Medical Staff of 200 men. As regards the food supplied to Netley and other hospitals, I am not aware that any complaints whatever have lately been made by the medical officers to the War Office as to the insufficient character of the food, or its unsuitableness. I believe, on the contrary, that it has been found to be both sufficient and good.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that the junior medical officers for the last few years have been constantly sent away from one station to another without having received due notice of the proposed change. I maintain that this constitutes great hardship to them, and is very detrimental to the efficiency of the Service. Young men who have been just told off for a particular district are moved about with hardly any notice at all. It reached my ears some time ago that the junior medical officers of the Army were getting up a very strong and formidable protest against the way in which they have been treated. It seems to me, in regard to the Army Medical Service, although of late years it has been vastly improved, that a great deal still remains to be done. If the Government really wish to preserve the health of the Army and keep the men fit for active service, or even for ordinary garrison service, they will certainly only be doing what is just and right if they endeavour to make the Army Medical Service—what it undoubtedly is not at the present moment—an efficient Service. I was sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman say just now, in the answer he gave to the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan), that he must have due regard to the expense that is incurred in providing medical necessaries. I find, in looking into the history of every war in which England has been engaged of late years, that, owing to the fact that the Army Medical Service had not received that due regard and attention to which it was entitled when a stress and strain was brought to bear upon the army in the field, the men invariably suffered. I am sorry to say that that has almost always been the result. Not merely have the men suffered, but the country has suffered also; and the difficulty has invariably been brought about by the process adopted here of cutting down the Army Medical Estimates too closely. I trust that while the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman is a Member remains in power they will try and do their best not to cut down these Medical Estimates, which are a matter of absolute necessity and a question of life and death, dealing, as they do, with the well-being of the Army. I sincerely hope they will receive full consideration at the hands of the right hon. Gentleman and the Government, and that, while Her Majesty's Ministers will do what is just and right to save the country from an extravagant expenditure, they will do all they can to place the Medical Service in a satisfactory condition. In going through these Estimates I certainly have not found them as satisfactory as they ought to be. In reporting upon the sanitary condition of the Northern district at York, Deputy Surgeon Tipton says that additional accommodation is required, more especially for the hospital staff. If the hospital staff is not provided with suitable accommodation close to the hospital, it is impossible for the patients in the hospital to receive proper care and attention. Deputy Surgeon General Reed reports from the Midland District that at Colchester a lunatic ward and a hospital for infectious diseases should be supplied.

As to the lunatic ward, that is altogether a matter for the consideration of the Government; but in regard to a hospital for infectious diseases, in a large garrison like that at Colchester I think it is a matter of absolute necessity that something of the kind should be instituted. Surely no one will say that small-pox patients, or patients suffering from other infectious diseases, should be mixed up with the ordinary hospital patients. I would also draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to this fact—that, not only in this Report, but in preceding Reports, this additional hospital ward accommodation has been asked for over and over again; but the subject has never received the attention which its importance demands. Then, again, I find that at Cambridge the drains have been very much out of order. The drains connected with the barracks and the hospitals have, I believe, been in many respects repaired; but a great many of them still remain out of order, and as regards the valves and traps over the drains remedial measures ought at once to be taken. In another Report attention is called to the ineffective condition of the drainage at Gosport. I think this a matter which deserves the most prompt attention at the present day, when everything bearing upon sanitary progress is exciting so much interest, and when steps are being taken to improve and preserve the health of the different sanitary districts; we are even endeavouring to carry out improved sanitary arrangements with regard to this House itself. It has become absolutely necessary that something should be done in this matter; and, so far as Gosport is concerned, I may remind the right hon. Gentleman that this is the second time the sanitary condition of that station has been reported upon. The right hon. Gentleman will find a reference to it in the Report of the brigade medical officer, at page 14. I find, on looking through these Reports, that the same complaints keep constantly re-appearing. The responsible medical officer in the district makes his Report; and, unfortunately, because it happens to be a Medical Report only, it is practically shelved. I find that the Reports of combatant officers, on the other hand, receive proper attention; but exactly the opposite course is taken in regard to the Medical Reports. I have, therefore, considered it my duty to bring these facts under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State. Then, again, in dealing with the grievances of the Army Medical Department, it certainly appears to be a lamentable state of affairs that in a Department of such great importance, where you have a number of gentlemen entering the Service after a long preparation and an expensive training, that they should be treated socially in an inferior manner. As a matter of fact, the medical officers in the Army are altogether placed outside the pale of society to which other officers are admitted. They are practically treated in the present day very much in the same way as the engineers in the Royal Navy are treated. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] I speak of facts that I am acquainted with, and I am prepared to maintain that that, unfortunately, is the case. It has been brought to my knowledge over and over again that medical officers are only tolerated as members of the messes at various stations, and that, in point of fact, whenever a slight can be cast upon them, it has been the custom to do so. I certainly hope that the right hon. Gentleman will endeavour to do something to remedy this very serious state of affairs, because it really is more serious than hon. Gentlemen may understand. I know, from acquaintance with many of these schools where medical men are educated and trained, that you do not get, in the Army Medical Service, the best men from those schools. The best men always try to stay at home, in the hope of being able to improve their position in this country by obtaining a private practice; and they will not, as a rule, place themselves under the benevolent care of Her Majesty's Government, where they have hitherto found themselves, generally speaking, driven from pillar to post. As a rule, in the past they have found themselves dismissed from the Service in the prime of life, with a very small sum of money —taking into account the intelligent services they have rendered, the cost of their education, and the time it has taken to train them. I maintain that, unless more care and attention is devoted by Her Majesty's Government to the Medical Service, instead of getting intelligent men, you will only secure the services of men who are, more or less, the ruck and scum of the schools. [*Cries* *of* "Oh!"] Yes, unfortunately, that will be the state of affairs. I speak strongly upon the matter; but I know exactly what I am talking about, because I have been living among the men themselves, and assisting some of them in their studies. I know that the Army Medical Service does not obtain the best men, because they do not receive that care and consideration to which they are fairly entitled. Then, again, when a stress comes on in a time of action, the state of affairs is still more deplorable. I quite agree with the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan) that the complaints of the medical officers ought to be fairly considered by the Government, and especially that medical officers should be afforded an opportunity of coming home at intervals, in order that they may attend the medical institutions, and be able to brush up their knowledge afresh, instead of remaining stationary, as usually happens to be the case. We know perfectly well that a medical officer stationed for seven or eight years in a hill district in India may have to look after occasional cases of fever, or certain peculiar diseases which occur in tropical climates, and when he comes to be removed to another district the knowledge which he had acquired seven or eight years before is of very little use to him in the performance of his new duties. As a matter of fact he has become stale, and he requires a little time in order to brush himself up again, and make himself more thoroughly acquainted with the progress of medical science. I therefore endorse all that fell from the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn, and I trust that Her Majesty's Government will pay due attention to these things, and not give the general public and the Medical Profession an opportunity of saying that the Service is allowed to suffer through the adoption of a cheese-paring policy.

CAPTAIN COTTON (Cheshire, Wirral): There is one special matter to which I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War—namely, the difficulty there is in providing proper rations for soldiers on the first day of their admission into hospital. The fact is that the daily rations of a soldier are drawn very early in the morning. If a man feels unwell, and goes to the hospital to see the doctor about 9 or 10 o'clock and he is sent into hospital, the only ration brought to him that day is the one which was drawn for him early in the morning. It is, therefore, quite obvious that if the man is very ill he might be unable to eat the three-quarters of a pound of meat with bone and gristle served out to him, and one of three things must happen—he either gets no food at all that day, if he is unable to eat the ration; or he has to depend upon the charity of his comrades; or else the medical officer, who has the power to do so, grants him extras. The medical officer is very loth, however, to grant extras, because it throws additional labour upon the Medical Staff in having to keep a journal of everything that happens, from the day of the man's admission into the hospital, until the day on which he is discharged from it. It is easy to see that the medical officer regards the writing of these notes as a great trouble and inconvenience, and no doubt it is; and, therefore, it is only in very extreme cases that he will grant the patient those medical comforts or extras which his condition demands on the first day of his admission into the hospital. I have no desire to detain the Committee; but I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to take into consideration whether some means may not be devised whereby a soldier, if necessary, shall be supplied with extras on the first day of his admission into the hospital, without the medical officer being required to keep a journal and make notes daily of the patient's progress. If this system of keeping journals were done away with altogether, the right hon. Gentleman would enjoy the merit, at any rate, of having eliminated from the Army Regulations one small piece of red tape. There is one other remark I should like to make in connection with what fell from the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), as to the social position which a medical officer occupies in the Army. I am afraid that I am obliged to endorse what the hon. Member has said upon that point. I believe that the position which medical officers now occupy in the Army is not nearly so good, socially speaking, as it was some 10 or 12 years ago, before the present system of the Army Medical Corps came into force. In the old days the medical officer formed part of the regiment, and he was treated as part of the regiment, the same as any other officer. It is through no fault of the combatant officers that the position of the medical officers is, socially speaking, not so good or so comfortable as it used to be. It is the fault of the system by which the medical officers are taken away from the regiments of which they formerly formed part, and with which they used to serve on the same terms as the combatant officers in all parts of the world.

General FRASER (Lambeth, N.): I am sorry to trespass on the time of the Committee; but I feel compelled to say a word upon the treatment of the medical officers of the Army. A long experience of 38 years in the Army does not allow me to concur with the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) in the statement that the medical officers have been treated with anything but respect and affection by members of the Army of all ranks. Nor can I endorse the statement that it is the "scum of the schools" which now joins the Service. At the present moment every man, whatever his rank may be, when he falls into sickness knows that his best and truest friends are the medical officers. There have been other questions raised in reference to the Medical Service; but I do not propose to enter into them.

Mr. TUITE (Westmeath, N.): I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War to the manner in which the sewage from the military barracks at Mullingar is dealt with. At present there are from 500 to 700 stationed there, and the sewage is drained into an open drain which passes under the public roads of the town. I believe it would cost from £200 to £300 to remedy the evil by constructing proper drain pipes to conduct the sewage into the river, and this is an expense which certainly ought to be undertaken by Her Majesty's Government. I am satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman only requires that his attention should be called to the nuisance in order to ensure its removal.

Mr. W. H. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the observations of my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour), I will consider whether it is advisable to give Returns of the numbers and stations of the medical officers serving in India. It has never been done hitherto, seeing that India bears the chief cost of the establishment. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), I really must be allowed, speaking on behalf of the Medical Service in the Army, to repudiate the statement of the hon. Gentleman that they, or any of them, are the "scum" of the schools.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I did not say that the medical officers actually serving at the present time in the Army are the scum of the schools; but I said that had been the result of the system in the past. I believe I added that last year the position of the Service had been improved.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I am glad to have given the hon. Member an opportunity of repudiating the statement which was calculated, I am certain, to inflict pain upon many excellent medical officers—gentlemen to whom the country owes a deep debt of gratitude for their devotion to the Service to which they belong. The hon. Member referred to the fact that the junior medical officers are sent about from place to place. I was not aware that that was the practice to any excessive extent; but, unfortunately, it is the case that all junior officers have to do junior's work, and probably the duties involve a little more personal change and discomfort than is the case after a medical officer has arrived at a higher rank. The changes which have been introduced into the Service were arrived at after full consideration by my Predecessors in Office, and I have no doubt that they were considered to be for the good of the Service and of the country. I cannot admit that the medical officers are not received by the gentlemen of the corps to which they are attached with all the consideration and respect due to their personal character and the eminent services they render to the regiment. With reference to the questions which have been referred to by other hon. Members, I can only promise to give careful consideration and attention to them; and I may add that wherever it is possible to improve the position of the medical officer, with due regard to the interests of the Service, and consistently also with the interests of the taxpayer, that position shall be improved. I will also inquire into the individual cases which have been mentioned, and see how far there has been inattention to the representations which have been made. I cannot admit that the authorities have been in the habit of refusing to pay attention to the representations and complaints of the medical officers, while those of combatant officers have been attended to, and it must not be forgotten that the medical officers are always able to exercise a certain amount of power in the Press, which procures for them an amount of attention which the combatant officers frequently find it impossible to obtain. The hon. and gallant Member for Wirral (Captain Cotton) has asked me to look into the question of the rations supplied to the soldier on the first day he enters hospital. I will make an inquiry into that matter, and the same answer will apply to the representation of the hon. Member opposite as to the defective drainage of the barracks at Mullingar. I am not aware that there are any further questions I ought to answer.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I wish to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War relative to a very important subject—namely, the Contagious Diseases Acts. I desire to know what precautions are being taken by the Military Authorities to preserve the health of the soldiers in regard to the particular class of diseases the Acts I refer to were passed to grapple with? I should also like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman can give us any information as to the extent to which these diseases have increased since the change was made in the law by the repeal of the Acts, and whether he is not disposed to recommend the renewal of the law which was repealed?

MR. W. H. SMITH: The provision for hospital accommodation is made under another Vote, which the hon. Member is probably not aware of. No additional provision has been made as to the health of the soldiers to meet the change which has been made in the law. The facts regarding the Contagious Diseases Acts, and the result of their repeal, will be inquired into this year, and it will be for the Government to consider what course they will adopt, between this period and the 31st March next, when they may have to propose to the House some measure with reference to the maintenance of the hospitals existing for the maintenance of the persons affected. I am sorry to say I have no information at the present moment as to the increase of disease; but if the hon. Member wishes for a Return, and will move for it, I shall be pleased to obtain it.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardineshire): I wish to call attention to an item on page 146, as to the employment of members of the Medical Staff on transports in connection with the Indian Government. I cannot find that any such officers have been employed hitherto. This is a new item, and it seems to me that it should not come in these Estimates, but should appear in the Admiralty Transport Vote. The appearance of the item in this Vote seems to me to be an irregularity which has sprung up this year for the first time. I think it is a thing that should be corrected, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will make a memorandum on the subject, with a view of seeing whether it is not a Vote that ought properly to belong to the Navy Estimates.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I should like to correct the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who wishes me to take the opportunity of repudiating the statement I made in reference to the medical officers of the Army Medical Department. I do not mean to repudiate that statement. I did not desire to convey the impression that the Department was recruited now more or less by the scum of the schools; but I maintain that in days gone by that was literally the case. ["No, no!"] Perhaps hon. Gentlemen opposite, who quarrel with that statement, have not been so intimately connected with the Medical Schools as I have been. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, and hon. and gallant Gentlemen opposite, that if they go into the statistics of the schools, and find how and by whom the Army was supplied with medical officers, they will find that the Service did not get, by any means, the best men from the schools. That is an absolute fact, and an investigation of the statistics will show what I say to be absolutely true. Therefore, I say I will not repudiate what I stated; but I certainly should not like it to go out that I had declared that the condition of things in this respect is as bad at present as it was in the past. On the contrary, I think it is much better on account of the attention which has been paid to this Department in the past few years. You are practically getting better men now; but if you are to employ medical officers, why, I ask, should you not get the best men? Why should your soldiers, to whom medical attendance is such an important matter, be deprived of the very best possible medical aid and attention? I have no doubt—I am confident—that if the right hon. Gentleman carries out that which he has declared to be his intention the Army Medical Department will very greatly improve. Then, with regard to another point I mentioned—that is to say, the sending of junior medical officers about from pillar to post to post, as a medical officer, who happened to be a friend of mine, was sent during the past year, I wish to add a word or two to my observations. This friend to whom I allude was sent first from Cork to Liverpool, then from Liverpool to Glasgow, from Glasgow to Cork, from Cork to Dublin, from Dublin to London, and so on. He was kept constantly moving about, and his health has lately broken down through his being so perpetually on the road. [*Laughter.*] Yes; I say his health has broken down. I maintain that to employ a gentleman in this manner is to use him really for convoy duty rather than as a medical officer. In like manner, the junior medical officers are sent about in what I must describe as an undue and reprehensible manner. If these medical officers are attached to certain districts, they ought to be left to those districts; and if medical officers are required to convoy troops from one station to another, there should be a certain number of these officers attached to the Army Medical Service told off for that particular duty. I feel it to be a great hardship, and I am certain that the House will agree with me, that a medical officer should be sent to the Cork district, and should be no sooner there, and settled down in his quarters, than he should get an order to start off to Liverpool; and that after being there a short time he should be allowed to return to Cork; and should be subsequently sent from there to some other place. The result of treating a man in this way is that he is put to great expense to furnish his quarters, and that all his expenditure is without any commensurate benefit so far as he himself is concerned. He is made to incur certain expenses that probably Her Majesty's Government are not at all cognizant of. I ask them, would it not be better to tell off a certain section of the Army Medical Corps for that particular kind of service, and allow the medical officers who are stationed in a certain district to do their duty in that district? It seems to me that that would be better for everybody. The recommendation appears to me to be founded on common sense, and I feel certain that the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State for War—than whom there could be no one more capable to appreciate what is adequate justice to the junior medical officers of the Army Medical Department—will take this matter into his favourable consideration. I trust he will kindly look into it, and see if it is possible to apply a remedy. There is yet another point to which I should like to draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention, and that is this:—That at the present time it is, unfortunately, the case, when an assistant surgeon joins the Army, within three months of his appointment—in some cases six months, but always within one year—he is sent straight away off to India. In this way, they practically do not get sufficient time after entering the Service to become properly acquainted with the military routine which it is absolutely necessary for them to be acquainted with for the proper fulfilment of their functions. The effect of the system adopted by the Government is that these young medical officers, when posts are entrusted to their charge in India, have not only the difficulties which a great change of climate is bound to bring about to contend with, but, owing to want of experience, they are practically incapable of paying that amount of attention to their professional duties which the necessities of those under their care require. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War whether it would not be better for the troops that, as far as possible, these young medical officers should not be sent away to India directly after passing their examinations and entering the Army Medical Service? If he will look into the statistics of the Army

Medical Department, he will find that a greater number of deaths occur amongst those officers within the first two years after they have joined this branch of the Service than take place at any other period. How is this to be accounted for? It is simply owing to the fact that when these men are sent away they are so young that they are not seasoned, and are unfit to plunge at once into the arduous duties of their profession and to bear the tropical heat and all those other circumstances which militate against the health in such a country as India. These men are cut down in the prime of their youth, and their death occasions this country the loss of a considerable sum of money. The Committee should bear in mind that the training of these officers costs the country a considerable amount to keep up; and after all the money which has been spent upon them, if an unduly high per centage of deaths occur, it is owing to the young men being sent too soon to India. I maintain that the point is one which ought to receive the earnest attention of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): There is one observation made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War which seems to me to clash a little with the evidence which has been laid before this House—namely, that medical officers get their recommendations as well attended to as do the combatant officers. The evidence taken by the Committee which sat to inquire into the transport and Commissariat arrangements of the Egyptian Campaign show that if that is true with regard to the recommendations of medical officers at home, it is not true of their recommendations abroad. The evidence is overwhelming that during the campaign the recommendations of medical officers out in Egypt were not properly attended to, despite the theory — I am quoting from memory — even though the recommendations were those of officers of high position. To use the words of a medical man, examined before the Select Committee on the Egyptian Campaign—"I was knocking about from pillar to post all day long," endeavouring to find means of transport for the medical stores, but was obliged to give it up, and the medicine chest did not reach the men until 24 hours after an engagement had been fought, though they were sorely needed.

MAJOR GENERAL GOLDSWORTHY (Hammersmith): I believe the circumstances referred to by the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) as to the medical officers do afford some reasonable ground of complaint. I refer to these young medical officers being sent to military stations directly after entering the Service. They arrive at the stations unknown, and they find that the senior medical officers are all married men; and they—the new comers—are thrown, in a great measure, upon their own resources. I can speak from my own personal knowledge that on many occasions they are sent to stations where there are two or three regiments, and they practically have no homes. In old days a medical officer was attached to the regiment, and was received with open arms by all the officers; he was practically part and parcel of the regiment. Now the medical officer belongs to a Department, and, practically, has no claim upon any special regiment; and whilst an officer of a regiment, whether a combatant military officer or belonging to the Medical Department, was called upon by regimental officers who made him an honorary member of their mess, young medical officers now, not knowing how long they are to be in a station, do not like to call on their brother officers in regiments. The constant shifting about of young medical officers is detrimental to their learning the military portion of their duty which it is necessary for them to know. I think I can explain a point referred to by the hon. Member for Mid Cork just now, when he spoke about the constant removals of these young medical officers and their being sent about with detachments. That system is in a great measure unavoidable, because the Medical Service is not as strong as it ought to be if you have these constant changes; but the country could do a great deal to make the position of these medical officers, who are liable to be shifted, a little easier. I know myself that medical officers were sometimes sent from Cork with detachments, and that they had no sooner returned to Cork than they were again sent with another detachment, and that this involved many of them having to get fresh lodgings—not quarters, because there were none available for them. Of course, in this way they sometimes lost a great deal of money. I think that if, in these cases, furnished quarters were provided for these officers, they would not have so much ground of complaint. The Departmental officers who are liable to be shifted, and also some of those who remain for a very long time on station, ought to be provided with furnished quarters. I mention this in reference to the Medical Department specially, as there is great hardship on the young medical officers under the present system, and there is no doubt that they do not feel as happy and as comfortable as they did under the condition of things which existed formerly. I believe also that it is detrimental to the Army to have the Medical Department organized as it is now, because it is within my own knowledge that one officer had three medical officers in successive days to attend him for a broken leg.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £285,000, to complete the sum for Militia Pay and Allowances.

Colonel WARING (Down, N.): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State if he will take into consideration the question of improving the pay and allowances of the Staff sergeants of Militia regiments serving on Militia engagements, so as to place those deserving upon a footing of greater equality with non-commissioned officers holding a similar position on Army engagements? The right hon. Gentleman will recollect that I called attention to the question last year, and that the hardship was admitted by the late Secretary of State for War, who promised to consider whether something could not be done to ameliorate their condition.

Mr. LLEWELLYN (Somerset, N.): The question to which I desire to draw attention is the unsatisfactory nature of the Militia drill and instruction. The shooting of the Militia is most unsatisfactory. It is not, however, to be wondered at, and for this reason—that there is no preliminary training for the Militiaman before he is taken on for a second year's service. It occurs to me that if the Militia, in addition to preliminary training, had to undergo, at least, a month's instruction in musketry, we should be better able to know whether a man was worth keeping or not. I know from experience that during the short period a Militia regiment is up for training there is a race between the Adjutant and the Musketry Instructor. The musketry instruction has to be got through somehow or other, and probably in bad weather; and it is also necessary that the men should undergo a satisfactory inspection in a march past. There is generally a race between the two, with the result very frequently of most imperfect instruction in musketry. What, with all deference, I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War is that the preliminary training should be undergone before the men are passed on to the strength of the regiment. Probably I may be told that many recruits would fail to attain the prescribed efficiency, and would be lost to the Service, so that the battalions would be very much reduced in size, and the men rendered unfit for inspection and fatigue duty. But what gain is there to the Service in retaining men who are absolutely useless in the field, because they are incapable of profiting by musketry drill? I maintain that this is a question of very great importance. I had the honour of serving for 18 years in the Militia, and I know that there were many armed men in the Force who, under no circumstances, would ever make good shots, seeing that they are incapable of being taught. If you keep men for six years they will never be any better. For most purposes they can only be regarded as paper men, whose services are not worth retaining.

Colonel BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): At present nearly all the time the Militia regiments have is devoted to drill. In my opinion, we ought to put up with a less standard of efficiency in battalion drill, in order that the men may be kept for a longer time at musketry training. I should, however, be sorry to see the Service lose any number of men by adopting the course proposed by the hon. and gallant Member.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) I presume that Militia bands are included in this Vote. Now, Sir, during the last Parliament I called attention two or three times to the fact that regimental bands were in the habit of playing at political demonstrations, and I believe, at that time, that some sort of Order was issued by the Military Authorities; but I never distinctly gathered what that Order was. I may say that I am constantly receiving letters—almost every day, indeed—from persons in different parts of the country, complaining of military bands being allowed to take part in political demonstrations.

COLONEL WARING: I rise to Order. It appears to me that the hon. Member is making this statement under a mistake. No public money whatever is granted for the support of Militia bands.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! Mr. Labouchere.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I see an item for 1,038 drummers. Who on earth are these drummers? I suppose they make a noise; and, judging from the demonstrations they go to, I presume that they please the people. I do not treat the question as one of Party, and I do not say whether the demonstrations attended by these military bands are Liberal or Conservative. I would, however, ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to lay down the law definitely, and say to what regimental bands the Order sent out a few months ago applies. Are we to understand that it applies to all bands the members of which wear Her Majesty's uniform? That, I think, would be a reasonable idea. I do not think that either Liberals or Conservatives ought to have bands playing for them in Army uniform; and if the right hon. Gentleman will issue an Order to that effect he will save a great deal of trouble, annoyance, and ill-feeling in many parts of the country.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devon, Ashburton): Having had upwards of 30 years' experience in connection with the Militia Service, and chiefly as an Instructor of Musketry, I desire to support what has been said about the necessity for an improved system of training. I know from experience that the musketry drill is carried out in a most unsatisfactory manner. A certain number of rounds are expended; but the ammunition, as a matter of fact, is wasted, and practically thrown away. The unsatisfactory character of the last Hythe Report on the Militia performances affords ample proof of this. In my opinion, the first consideration in training a soldier in the present day is to make him a thoroughly good rifle shot. It is impossible to have a regiment which can in any way be regarded as a force available for the purposes of defence unless the men belonging to the regiment are thoroughly instructed in musketry, and are converted by prolonged practice into good, steady riflemen. I regard that as being of far greater importance than any mere superficial efficiency in drill. The time of Militia regiments is at present needlessly wasted in teaching battalion movements, nine-tenths of which are as obsolete as the movements of the Macedonian Phalanx or the Roman Legion. If we want to have a thoroughly efficient Militia regiment, we should confine our training to squad and company drill, and then men who are thoroughly efficient in these drills can at any time, in a very short period, be put in possession of what is necessary for them to know under existing circumstances in connection with the battalion drill. Good steady shooting is a much more difficult matter, and can only be produced by careful drill and long and frequently repeated practice. I have a Notice upon the Paper for to-morrow, in which I propose to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War a Question in reference to Militia training, and I do trust that between this and the next period of training a much better system will have been adopted for the instruction of Militia regiments.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to the practice now followed in regard to the payment of Militiamen upon their disembodiment. I am sure that hon. Members who know anything of the subject will agree with me that some of the scenes which occur at the disembodiment of the Militia after they have been out for training, are most disgraceful. I am satisfied that the hon. Member who is acquainted with the North of Ireland will agree with me in that remark.

COLONEL WARING: On behalf of my own regiment I certainly do not.

MR. J. O'CONNOR: Nevertheless, I am certain that the hon. and gallant Member will concur with me that it would be for the benefit of the men themselves if some alteration were introduced into the system under which these Militiamen are paid off. I did think, even if only for once, that the hon. and gallant Member opposite would have been found to agree with hon. Members on this side of the House, and I am sorry that there is not even a single point upon which we are likely to agree. I am sure he will not deny, nor will the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War deny, that men who have been under the restraint of discipline for some months, and who are not accustomed to military restraint and discipline as a general rule, may be inclined to go farther than they otherwise would when that restraint is removed. I believe that that is only a natural rule, and I may say that even hon. Members who sit in this House are not free from influences of that kind. We all know what the restraints of duty are, and the great desire that exists in the breasts of ordinary mortals to indulge in a little relaxation when the restraint is removed. What I contend is, that it is detrimental to the men who belong to the Militia themselves that they should be paid on the day they are disembodied; and I believe that the Committee will agree with me that it would be much more beneficial to them, and to their families, if a postal order or a cheque were sent to pay them at their homes, rather than that they should get their full pay on the day of disembodiment, to be spent sometimes, I am afraid, in rioting and excesses which tend to depreciate Her Majesty's Forces in the eyes of the public. I have no wish to cast a slur even on the regiment which the hon. and gallant Colonel commands, and of which I have no doubt he will give us a good account; but I have seen different corps of Militia disembodied all over Ireland, and even in England and Wales, and I say that there is a remarkable uniformity in the way in which they spend their pay. Very little of it ever finds its way to their families. Many of the scenes I have witnessed on these occasions have been most distressful indeed. I have seen Militiamen go upon a "spree" which has lasted for many days; and when I remember that the families of these men have been deprived of their services for months, that their labour has not been devoted to the support of their wives and children, but that they have given their services to their country, I think it is only a fit and proper thing for this House to interfere with the way in which they usually spend the money which is given to them, in order to induce them to devote it in the future, in some measure, to the wants and necessities of their families. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to take this matter into consideration, for the purpose of putting an end to the discreditable scenes which we all witness from time to time on the disembodiment of this branch of Her Majesty's Forces, and that he will adopt some other way of paying them. I would suggest a means which I believe is in operation already in some branches of Her Majesty's Service—namely, that of sending home a portion of the money which has been earned. [An hon. MEMBER: Deferred pay.] I am informed that this can be kept back as deferred pay, and I believe that in reference to the Navy one-half of the pay is sent home to the family. Then, upon every ground, I think the proposition I make ought to recommend itself to the Committee; and I trust that the right hon. Gentleman will take it seriously into his consideration, and that he will provide some means by which the pay of Militiamen may be sent home to their families at the time of the disembodiment of the force, so that it may be of real benefit, not only to themselves, but to their families.

MR. TUITE (Westmeath, N.): I wish to emphasize the observations which have been made by the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor). I have witnessed the disembodiment of the Westmeath Militia in the town in which I reside—Mullingar, and I have seen in that town disgraceful scenes of riot and drunkenness for some days after the disembodiment has taken place. I know, further, that the calling out of the Militia generally brings into the town, which becomes their headquarters, a band of thieves and disorderly characters, who make it their business to rob the unfortunate members of the Militia when they get drunk. The town of Mullingar has, on more than one occasion, been a scene of riot and disturbance on the occasion of the disembodiment of the Militia. The men are out at all times of the night; they sleep in the ditches and barns round about, and they are the promoters of scenes of riot and disorder which would be a disgrace to any civilized country. I cannot see why such scenes should be allowed to take place when an easy remedy could be provided. If the money is sent home to the families they would obtain some advantage from the time the head of the family has served in the Army; but at present I am afraid that every penny of the money received is spent in drink.

COLONEL WARING: I hope the Committee will allow me to say one word upon this question. In the first place, I must deny that it is the practice of Militia regiments, on disembodiment, to behave in the manner which has been described, nor is it at all general for disorders of this kind to occur, and when they do occur it is the fault, according to my experience, of the Commanding Officer. If anything like proper precautions are taken no such scenes are likely to occur in connection with any well-regulated regiment. As a rule, the Commanding Officer makes an arrangement with the station master to remove the men as soon as their duties have ended, and everything is carried on orderly and to the satisfaction of everybody concerned. With regard to the proposal of the hon. Member to remit the money due to the men in payment of their services home to their family, I do not think that would work well at all. At the present moment every encouragement and assistance is given to the man if he desires to remit home a portion of the money due to him while he is undergoing training; but to remit the whole of it in the way suggested on the termination of the training would be most inconvenient. Many of the men who go up for training have left work in England, Scotland, or elsewhere in order to attend the training, and they go back again when they are disembodied, not knowing where they are certain to get work. It would put such men to serious inconvenience if such a Regulation as that which has been suggested by the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) were acted upon.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): The hon. and gallant Member for Down (Colonel Waring) disagrees with my hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) as to the conduct of Militia regiments when they are disbanded. I have no doubt that the regiment which the hon. and gallant Colonel commands is *facile princeps*—the first Militia regiment in the United Kingdom. It has, however, been my lot to see a considerable number of Militia regiments disbanded in the county to which I belong, and for a part of which I have had the honour to be returned to this House. Indeed, I may say that I have many friends who are connected with Militia regiments; and although it is not necessary to particularize any one regiment, I may say that I have seen many of them disbanded, and am able to speak of the results of the practice which the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite says has been found to act so well. I have seen the Militia marched down to a railway station and put into carriages, and I have seen their officers compelled to stand over them in such carriages with swords in their hands on some occasions, and with sticks on others. Unfortunately, when the trains arrived at the first junction, or at the first stopping place where a drink could be obtained, everything in the shape of discipline was at an end. Let me give an instance in reference to the City of Cork, where I live. Several regiments are sent there for training, and they come from Kinsale, and sometimes, as in the present year, from Spike Island; they are brought by steamers from Spike Island and by train from Kinsale, and when they arrive at Cork they are met by a large crew of women and children, who await the arrival of the steamer or train. Both women and children are generally provided with bottles, and directly the men come in the nearest public-houses are taken by storm by the gallant members of Her Majesty's Militia. Unfortunately, the disturbances which are brought about by this system of disbanding the Militia and paying them off is frequently productive of serious evil. In the case of one Militia regiment, the name of which, however, I will not mention, I saw the men after being disbanded go into the barrack square and assault the guard, literally driving them across the yard, and some of the most outrageous incidents which it is possible to imagine occurred. So much has this been the case that people nowadays to look upon a Militiaman as another name for a rowdy, and the two terms are synonymous. I recollect a case which occurred in connection with the Limerick Bench of Magistrates. A boy was brought up charged with having committed a felony, and some of the magistrates on the Bench happened to be officers of the Limerick Militia Regiment. The mother of the prisoner came up and begged hard to have her boy let off, asserting that he was her sole support and only hope. The magistrates inquired into the case, and they found that that was so—that he was the only hope she had of obtaining aid and assistance outside the prison. Nevertheless, the magistrates felt called upon to reject the woman's appeal; whereupon she turned round and said—

> "My eldest son was hanged, I have another undergoing penal servitude. My only girl has gone God knows where, but thank God there never was any member of my family in the Militia."

That is a kind of character which attaches to the position of a Militiaman; at any rate, in Ireland. I can only express a hope that the right hon. Gentlemen will give some consideration to the proposition of my hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor), and make arrangements by which these men in future will not receive full payment for their services on the day of their disembodiment.

Mr. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN (Stirling, &c.): I venture to think that the point which has been raised deserves consideration. It is quite possible that some of the statements which have been made are highly coloured, and that they will not bear the strictest investigation. I have no doubt that by proper arrangements on the part of the officers much of the evil which has been described may be avoided; but still it will always be found that something of the kind occurs when large bodies of men are paid simultaneously. Some years ago that was found to be the case with regard to the enrolled pensioners. The enrolled pensioners were called together to receive payment in person on a certain day, and the result was that a great many of them spent the money they received in drink, and in conviviality among each other. The authorities became alive to the evils of the system, and a right hon. Friend near me, who was then Secretary of State for War, introduced the plan of paying the pensions by means of Post Office orders which were sent to the homes of the men, and thus temptation was removed. I am not aware whether any system of that kind could be applied to the Militia; but I would urge upon my right hon. Friend that it is certainly a point which deserves to be looked into. The only other topic to which I will allude is that which has been raised by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). My hon. Friend is very much exercised on the subject of the presence of bands at political demonstrations, and I confess that I entirely share his views upon the question. Indeed, I cannot think there can be two opinions as to the propriety of keeping the Army and Navy entirely separated from all political feeling. We civilians have quite enough of political controversy and discussion without importing them into the two Services. If I remember rightly, the Queen's Regulations lay down that no soldier, including, of course, Militiamen for that purpose, is allowed to attend any political demonstration near the camp or barracks in which he is stationed, nor is he to go to any political demonstration whatever if he is in uniform. Now, that is the point. It is alleged that these bands go in uniform, and that, therefore, they give the sanction of military approval to demonstrations of a Party character. I found, when I was at the War Office, no difference of opinion on the subject, and all the staff were as anxious as I was to pnt a stop to this proceeding. His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief issued a letter, or a communication, calling attention to the paragraph in the Queen's Regulations on the subject. That was all that was done, and perhaps it was not sufficient. If so, I hope something further will be done to prevent what I think would be a calamity to the country and to the Services themselves, if the men should ever get mixed up either on one side or the other with political demonstrations. There is only one other remark I desire to make, and it has reference to a matter mentioned by the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel Waring). The hon. and gallant Gentleman brought forward the well-known grievances of the Militia Staff sergeants, and he stated that they were admitted grievances. In making use of that expression the hon. and gallant Gentleman has attributed to me an opinion altogether contrary to that which I have entertained. I think that there may be an apparent grievance; but in reality I do not admit that it is one of a pressing character.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.): There is one suggestion I should like to offer in reference to the Militia. I do not think they are out for training long enough. I do not see how we can expect men to learn much about their drill in 28 days; I therefore think that it would be to the advantage of the Militia that they should have a longer term of training than at present; and if it could be made 48 days, or even longer than that, it would be of great advantage to the Militia Service. A few years ago the Militia were called out for longer periods of training, and very good results were produced from the longer drill they underwent; they were rendered much more efficient in their work. There is another point which I also desire to mention. Perhaps it is not generally known, but it is nevertheless a fact, that somehow or other a number of men manage to enrol themselves in different regiments; and some men, I am informed, have received payment for their services in the Militia from no less than three different regiments. That is a somewhat extraordinary circumstance, and I believe that it results from the manner in which the men are called out. It is certainly a point which deserves attention at the hands of the Government. Then, again, something ought to be done to improve the arms which are served out to the Militia. I know that the Artillery Militia still have the old carbines. Cartridges of different kinds are also served out, and in the event of the Militia being called out for active service you would inevitably have many mistakes occurring owing to different kinds of ammunition being supplied for different descriptions of arms. In the Egyptian War mistakes of that nature took place, and in some instances ammunition was given out which was not suitable for the weapons that were carried; and if in the Militia you are to continue the Snider rifles there will be very great danger of serious mistakes of the kind occurring. Then, again, the guns which are given to the Militia Artillery ought to be improved. The guns and other weapons supplied to them are altogether obsolete, and yet they are now required to learn their drill upon them. In many places you have 24-pounder guns which are really armaments of a fossilized character nowadays; they are guns that shoot very badly, and if you fire at a target at a range of 500 yards with a 24-pounder, the shot would go 40 or 50 yards to the right or left. The muzzle-loading ordnance supplied to the Militia is also out of date, and useless to assist the men in drill. I have no doubt there are many other instances, and I believe that the weapons supplied to the Militia require to be changed altogether. Another point is the fines imposed upon the men for irregularities. The men expect at the end of the training to have a certain amount of money coming to them; but it is likely to be curtailed if they have done anything wrong. It is very hard upon the men to find when the period of training is over that instead of receiving a pound or two, or whatever the sum may be, they only get a few shillings. I believe it would be advantageous if a more regular system were introduced by which the men could calculate exactly what they would receive when the training was over. It is only regulated now according to the whim of the officer, who can cut off as much or as little as he likes. I am informed that this is felt as a considerable grievance among the men.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): There are one or two questions which have been raised upon which I should like to say a word. I think, myself, that there may be some objection to bandsmen being allowed to go to a political demonstration in uniform, yet, at the same time, I see no reason why they should not be engaged there if they are out of uniform. It must always be remembered that the pay of a bandsman is very small, and he is allowed to supplement it by the gratuities he receives from attending entertainments, whether political or temperance, or whatever they may be. It would be a great misfortune if he were deprived of all opportunity of obtaining these gratuities. I do not consider it absolutely necessary, because a bandsman goes to a Primrose League entertainment, that, therefore, he is to be regarded as sharing the opinions of the Primrose League. My own opinion is that if Liberals had bands a little oftener at their entertainments they would not be so fond of grumbling at our bands.

Some men are not fond of music. I knew a man who only knew two tunes—one of which was "God save the Queen," and the other was not. At the same time we all have our opinions, and the mere fact of a band playing at a Primrose League meeting, or a meeting of the Liberal Party, I am perfectly certain would have no influence upon the opinions of the public in any way whatever.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War whether, if bands are allowed to play at Primrose League meetings and Liberal meetings, they should not also be allowed to play at our National League meetings? I think it would be highly invidious to draw the line of distinction at any political Party whatever; and I trust that if the right hon. Gentleman allows the employment of a military band in one case he will allow it in another.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I will treat the questions which have been addressed to me in the order in which they have been put; and if I fail to answer any hon. Gentleman who has spoken, I trust that my attention will be called to the omission. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Down (Colonel Waring) spoke of an alleged grievance on the part of the Staff sergeants of Militia. I am afraid that I can give no more favourable answer than that which was given by my right hon. Predecessor. There is no doubt that these valuable non-commissioned officers receive less pay than they would if they were on the Staff of the Regular Army; but they enjoy other advantages, and they receive as much as it was understood they should have. I am not in a position to undertake that a higher rate of pay will be awarded to them than that which is now considered sufficient for the services they render. I fully agree with the remarks which have been made as to the importance of the Militia being efficient in musketry practice, and I will give the subject my best consideration with the view of ascertaining what improvement can be effected. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) has called attention to the employment of military bands at political demonstrations. I entirely concur with the right hon. Gentleman the late Secretary of State for War that the Queen's uniform should not be associated in any way with Party politics. So far as the Army and Navy are concerned, I believe it has always been their desire to avoid, even in this House, any identification with political Party; and I am sure it is for the advantage of the country that the same course should be followed in every branch of the Service. I will communicate with the proper authorities, and so far as my influence can be exercised I will endeavour to secure that no person in the Queen's uniform shall be allowed to attend a Party demonstration of any character. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) referred to the question of the payment of Militiamen on the day after their disembodiment. I can only say that if it is possible to introduce any improvement into the system of payment I will endeavour to effect it. The hon. Member is aware that the men have to sign for the pay they receive when the training is concluded; and I am not quite certain if it is in my power, or the power of the Department, to insist that they shall receive payment in another place instead of the place where they are disembodied. At the same time I fully admit that the case is one which requires attentive consideration; and if anything can be done to improve the moral condition of the men or those dependent upon them, no effort will be spared on my part to effect it. The hon. Member for Dublin County (Sir Thomas Esmonde) has referred to the question of the duration of Militia trainings. I think the hon. Baronet is not aware that Militia recruits are trained for 56 days, irrespective of the period during which their regiments may be called out. As to maintaining Militia regiments in training for a longer period than 28 days, that is a matter which would require careful consideration. It would involve a very considerably increased charge upon the Estimates, and I am not prepared to say that any change of that sort could be brought about without very serious consideration. The hon. Baronet has referred also to the question of fraudulent enlistment. There is no doubt that fraudulent enlistment does occur on certain occasions; but I doubt whether there are any Militiamen who can find it possible to belong to three or four regiments at the same time. It might even occur that all the regiments would be called out at the same time, and then the fraud would be at once detected. Although a man may be able to pass muster in two different places, it is hardly possible that he would succeed in three or more. Reference has been made to the training of the Artillery Militia. I believe it will be found that Artillery Militia regiments are generally quartered in places where they are trained in the use of the newest and best description of guns. I think I have now answered all the questions which have been addressed to me.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: In reference to the last remark of the right hon. Gentleman, I may say that in one of our fortified stations there is a gun which is supposed to have been there since 1641. With regard to the drilling of recruits, I believe it is a fact that the recruits may take their 56 days' drill whenever they join, and they can join at any period of the year they like. It does not follow that all Militia recruits join at the same time. It is quite possible for a recruit to join one regiment at one period of the year and another regiment at another period—I believe, in point of fact, that that is the case now in some instances.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I observe that the sum charged in the Vote this year for levy money for medical fees on enrolment and re-enrolment, and on other heads under Subhead E, page 37, shows an increase from £9,000 to £14,000 in the present year. An increase of £5,000 upon that one particular item is a startling increase, because it represents the Militia as a whole, and it would almost appear to suggest that there has been almost double the amount of recruiting for the Militia this year over the previous financial year. If that is so, the condition of the Militia might reasonably be expected to be very different from what it was before; but when I go to the bottom of the page I find that last year the Militia Establishment was 129,000 men, but only 98,000 men came up for training; so that there were 31,000 men absent. I think it would be much better that the authorities should endeavour to make the Militia something more than a paper force, and not allow the levy money to increase without any explanation at all from £9,000 to £14,000. There is another point upon which I should like to have a word of explanation. I notice that the sum of £4,800 is taken on account of Militia fines for drunkenness. I should like to know what the explanation is of so large a sum being set down for this item, inasmuch as the whole amount of fines for drunkenness in the Regular Army only amounts to £1,100, and the Militia is only on duty for so short a period? It is perfectly plain that there ought to be some explanation of this item of £4,800 taken on account of fines in the Militia for drunkenness. I find that in the last account of the Comptroller and Auditor General reference is made to these fines for drunkenness. It is stated that an application had been made by the War Office for permission to appropriate the fines on account of drunkenness; and it is added that the fines have been accumulating for some years past at the rate of about £600 a-year. I find a letter, signed L. Courtney, from the Treasury Chamber, authorizing the appropriation of £600; but there is nothing at all stated with regard to the further sum of £4,200, which appears in the present Vote.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I find in the Estimates that the fines for drunkenness in the Militia are put down at £4,800; but I am not able at this moment to give any explanation of the item. I believe there has been an accumulation of arrears since 1867. As the hon. Member is aware, I have not prepared these Estimates, and consequently I cannot answer fully all these matters of detail. The sum of £14,000 referred to by the hon. Member is the total amount of levy money paid for fees on enrolment and re-enrolment.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: If the right hon. Gentleman will look at the Estimates he will see that the same Estimate for 1885-6 for levy money and enlistment fees was £9,000, and this year it is £14,000, being an increase of £5,000 upon the year. Surely if £9,000 was sufficient in the year 1885-6 the fact that £14,000 is asked for now requires some explanation. The explanation which the right hon. Gentleman has given as to the fines for drunkenness is only what I expected. It appears that the process of accumulation has been going on, and that the sum now given in the Estimates represents the result of the accumulation. I believe that some years ago these fines for drunkenness were handed over to the Stock Purse Fund in a different manner from the way in which the money is appropriated now. That was recognized as a regimental fund; but of late years the War Office has put its hands upon that money, instead of allowing the regiment to have the benefit of it. The difference in the course of procedure now adopted is certainly startling. If the regiments were entitled to the money some time ago, surely they are as much entitled to it now; and I think they are fairly entitled to complain—I mean those who are in charge of the Stock Purse Fund—that it is not handed over to them now.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The hon. Gentleman, as I have already stated, is aware that I did not prepare these Estimates; therefore I am not able to give him all the explanation he desires. But I believe that this change in the appropriation of the fines for drunkenness was done with a view of meeting the necessities of the case.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): With respect to the pay of the Militia officers, I should like to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War and of the House to the actual state of affairs which at present exists in connection with those officers. Anyone who has had any acquaintance with the Militia and the Militia officers both in England and Ireland knows very well that the officers are very frequently altogether incompetent and incapable of doing their duty in the way in which it ought to be done. Unfortunately I have myself, from time to time, witnessed a great deal of this incompetency on the part of many of the Militia officers; and I should like to learn how it comes to pass that these men do not know their duty, and are incapable of performing it. As a matter of fact, it arises simply because the Militia training every year is looked upon as a gigantic joke. It is regarded as a portion of the year's amusement. A number of men form themselves into a kind of club; they travel about in uniform, and spend the larger part of their time in playing lawn tennis by day and cards by night. Perhaps I may be allowed to give the House an instance of the way in which these Militia officers, and notably some of the higher officers in command of Militia regiments, perform their duty. A case came to my knowledge a few years ago which has reference to a Militia regiment which I do not propose to name. The officer in command of the regiment went on parade, and he was asked when he got there to put the men through certain evolutions, which I believe are known as putting them through their manual exercise. I believe that duty is not a very difficult one, and that it is, practically speaking, the A. B. C. of the most elementary Militia work; but when this Commanding Officer came to issue his commands he was not very long before he committed a mistake. It was passed over, however, and then a very short time afterwards he committed a second blunder, the result of which was that one-half of the regiment went off in one direction while the other half went in another, whereupon this gallant officer slapped the pommel of his saddle, and exclaimed, "Looed again." I think that anecdote will convince the House that these Militia officers are not in earnest at all, and that when they are called upon to go through the most elementary portion of their work they are unable to do so without committing ludicrous mistakes. Some of them may be capable of marching into a barrack square and taking themselves out again; but they are by no means competent to go through even the most ordinary military evolutions. No doubt there are able officers connected with the Militia regiments, officers who have served for a considerable time in the Regular Army, and who have been placed on the Reserve List. Of course, officers of that character are capable of understanding their duties, and of carrying them out successfully. In addition to such officers, there are a certain number of young officers in the Militia who also understand their duty. These are young men who are intending to go up for Army examinations—young men who find that they could not pass a direct examination in order to obtain a commission, and who join the Militia Force, and then endeavour, by attention to their duties and diligence, to obtain one of the commissions which are given to Militia officers, and thus, as it were, they stray into the Regular Service. I believe there are many instances in which, in this way, young men endeavour to pass from the Militia into the Regular Army; and what I desire to complain of is the unfair treatment which many of these young men receive. Now, it certainly appears to me, and I happen to possess some knowledge in connection with this force, that a considerable number of these young men who are trying to pass from the Militia into the Army are treated very roughly. A good many of them have been down on the list for a long time; but, owing to the exercise against them of family influence and other influences in connection with social position, many of them who ought to have obtained commissions long ago are passed over solely because there are other candidates who are put over their heads because they happen to be of a higher social rank than those who are left behind. Now, I maintain that that is a very unfortunate state of affairs, and that it ought to be seen to. In reviewing the capacity of Militia officers, I believe it will be found that, practically speaking, the two classes I have mentioned are the only ones which are worth being retained in the Service. I think there ought to be a better system of examination—I mean of practical examination—for Militia officers of all ranks, and that is a suggestion which I believe will be endorsed by hon. and gallant Gentlemen opposite. There should be a system not only of examination, but of exercise, for all ranks of Militia officers, not in the usual farcical way which has been the case up to the present moment, but altogether on a sound and intelligent plan; and in that case, instead of having a large body of officers who are altogether incapable of doing their duty, you would be able very materially to improve the Militia Service, and raise the *status* of all persons connected with it.

MR. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr): I observe in this Vote an item for the payment of Lieutenancy Clerks. I should like to have an explanation of what it means.

MR. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.): Are we to understand that military bands, when not in uniform, will be allowed to attend political demonstrations? Is the objection only to bands being employed in uniform?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I have no control whatever over the bands belonging to the Militia.

MR. MOLLOY: I have not received an answer to my question—Who are the Clerks of the Lieutenancy, and what work do they do?

MR. W. H. SMITH: They are clerks who do perform work in connection with Militia Companies. They are paid under an Act of Parliament.

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): I quite concur in the remarks which have been made in reference to the Militia, and especially in reference to what has been stated by my hon. Friend the Member for North Westmeath (Mr. Tuite). An hon. Gentleman sitting above the Gangway on this side of the House said that squad drill and company drill would be quite sufficient for the Militia. I quite agree with him; and if an arrangement of that description could be carried out I believe it would confer an immense advantage upon the country. At present, young men reared in the country towns who may be perfectly harmless, and even intelligent young men, unfortunately join the Militia, and after having served with the regiment, and having been sent to whatever town the regiment is required to assemble in, they return home, I am sorry to say, to their native towns to a great extent finished ruffians. There is another point which is also deserving of attention. A good many of the men who belong to the Militia are married; and I think it is most desirable, if the requirements of the Service permit, that they should be left at home with their families. As to the officers of the Militia, it appears to me that the Militia Force has been brought into existence solely for the benefit of the landed aristocracy of the country, in order to give them a firm grip over the people, to confer upon them additional *status*, and in that way to assist them in carrying out that system of oppression which for so long a period has been connected in so large a degree with the landed aristocracy of the country. I am sorry to say that this remark applies quite as much to the Regular Army as to the Militia; but as we have not yet reached the Vote for the Regular Army, I presume that, as a matter of Order, I must confine my remarks to the Militia. My opinion of the position of a soldier is this—I think that every man, whether he joins the Militia or the Regular Army, should be required to join as a private soldier, and that he should work up from the position of a private soldier to that of an officer. In the next place, they should all mess together, and live together, and share each other's comforts and discomforts. As soldiers, every man in the Army or Militia ought to be upon a footing of equality. I trust that the Department which has the control of the Militia will consider in some respects the desirability of altering the existing system. If every man was required, as I contend he ought to be required, to join as a private soldier, there would be a great deal more respect paid to intelligence, and very little to the superior social position occupied by one man over another, and the result in the end would be to increase very materially the comfort of the Army.

Mr. MOLLOY: I am sorry that I am compelled to return again to the question I put to the right hon. Gentleman just now in reference to the item which appears in this Estimate of £3,000 for Clerks of Lieutenancy. I know that in former days the Lords Lieutenant of counties had the appointment of officers in the Militia, and no doubt it was quite proper that they should have clerks to assist them in the work they had to do. But, at the present moment, the Lords Lieutenant of counties have nothing to do with the Militia appointments; and, with the exception of filling themselves sometimes the position of honorary Colonel, no work whatever falls upon them in connection with the Militia. Therefore, this sum of £3,000 which appears in the Estimate represents £3,000 paid under an Act of Parliament when they had actual work to do; but, notwithstanding that the work has been taken away, the item for the payment of it is still retained. The point I wished to ascertain from the right hon. Gentleman was who these clerks are, and what work they have to do? The right hon. Gentleman informs the Committee that the money is paid, and this Vote retained under an Act of Parliament; but, if that is so, I should have thought the sum would have been debited to the Consolidated Fund. It is quite clear, however, that it is money which is paid for work which was done at one time, but which has now ceased. Therefore, at the present moment, this sum of £3,000 is being paid—Heaven knows to whom—perhaps to clerks who do other work for which they are paid from another source. Personally, I am of opinion that this item of £3,000 has no right to appear on the Estimates at all.

Mr. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.): Under the heading of "fines for drunkenness" there is an item of £4,800 to which attention has already been called. Now, in my opinion, the same law ought to apply to everybody in the Militia, from the Colonel right down to the humblest private. I should, therefore, like to learn from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War what is the amount which has been contributed by officers of Militia to these fines for drunkenness? I know a regiment in which, bad as the men are, the officers are a great deal worse; and I want to know what proportion of these fines for drunkenness paid by them is their share of this £4,800? I sincerely hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to state the amount contributed by the officers as well as that paid by the privates. There is an impression that the stoppages of pay to which reference is made in the Estimates consists exclusively of fines imposed upon privates.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. St. John Brodrick) (Surrey, Guildford): In reply to the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy), I have to say that the clerks to the Lord Lieutenants have still special duties to perform in connection with the Militia. The fees consist of certain allowances for actual work, and those allowances have, in fact, decreased under the Act of Parliament rather than increased. The work of the clerks is not as great as it was, and, on the other hand, the scale of remuneration is very much lower.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): I presume it is requisite that there should be a stated time for calling out the Militia for training; but I believe the period of the year in which they are at present called out is the most inconvenient which could be selected. The embodiment of the Militia takes place in the summer months, when there is plenty of work to be found in agricultural pursuits. I know that, as far as Ireland is concerned, it would be of great advantage if the training could take place in the early spring months, when there is little or no work on the farms. At present the farmers are constantly complaining that when they want the services of farm labourers the men are off to the Militia for training. So far back as 1879 it was suggested that the training should take place in the early spring months, and we were then told that it was for the convenience of the War Office and the State that the Militia were called out in the summer. In view of the destitution, which I am sorry to say we may all expect in the coming winter, I think the Government ought to fix the training for a period when it would be most to the advantage of the Militiamen and to the general public. In the summer time, when the training goes on as a rule, there would be no difficulty in obtaining labourer's work all over the country; whereas in the early spring months—February and March—there is no work to be obtained. It would, therefore, be of great advantage to the men and to their families that they should be at the disposal of the War Office when it is difficult for them to obtain other employment, and free to take employment in the summer months, when there is abundance of farm labour to be procured. I sincerely hope that the Government will take the question into their serious consideration, especially now that there is every reason to suppose that before many months have passed there will be great destitution all over Ireland.

MR. A. BLANE: I have not yet received a reply from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State to my question whether officers of Militia are ever fined for drunkenness? It is well known that stoppages are imposed upon the men; but what I want to know is whether fines are also inflicted upon the officers for the same offence?

MR. W. H. SMITH: The hon. Gentleman does not seem to be aware that if an officer is charged with drunkenness he is tried by court martial, and, if found guilty, is dismissed the Service.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I wish to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman in reference to a transaction connected with a particular regiment of Militia—the Cavan Militia. I put a Question upon the subject the other day, and as the answer was not satisfactory I gave Notice of my intention to raise it again upon the Estimates. The question I wish to put is whether the right hon. Gentleman can account for, or give any reason why, the absence of Captain Somerset Maxwell from the training of the Cavan Militia Regiment, both this year and last; and whether it is usual, in the case of Militia officers like Captain Somerset Maxwell, to allow them to combine the pleasure and amusement of Militia soldiering with the more unpleasant business of electioneering? The discharge of one duty is evidently incompatible with the efficient performance of the other; and, in order to fulfil the one, it was absolutely necessary that Captain Somerset Maxwell should neglect the other. What I want to know is, how it was that Captain Somerset Maxwell was allowed to enjoy this very singular privilege, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman, or some other Member of Her Majesty's Government, may be able to account for the extraordinary conduct of the Colonel commanding the Cavan Regiment of Militia? It does seem to be an extraordinary state of affairs that; because Captain Somerset Maxwell happened to be an unsuccessful Tory candidate for one of the Divisions of Belfast, from which he was suddenly withdrawn by a distinguished Member of this House—the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). It seems very strange to me that the same thing should have been tolerated, not only last year, but this year as well; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give some reason why it should have been permitted.

MR. W. H. SMITH: The hon. Gentleman is aware that I was not in Office when the General Election took place, and that if anybody connected with the Government is responsible for what occurred it is my Predecessor. But, as a matter of fact, the granting of leave of absence is regulated by the Military Authorities; and if an officer is a candidate for a seat in Parliament, I believe it is customary for him to obtain leave, whatever his politics may be. But, however that may be, I understand that Captain Somerset Maxwell obtained leave on the occasion to which the hon. Member referred, on the ground of ill-health.

DR. TANNER: The right hon. Gentleman says that Captain Somerset Maxwell obtained leave on the ground of ill-health. It would therefore appear that, finding he was unable on account of illness to perform the comparatively easy duties which a Militia officer is required to perform, Captain Somerset Maxwell obtained leave of absence, and then found himself able to take an active part in a contested election, and an election which was attended with a great deal of disturbance and ill-feeling in the North of Ireland. The health of Captain Somerset Maxwell seems to have been quite good enough for that, although it was not good enough to enable him to go through the duties of a Militia officer called out for a short period of training.

Mr. P. J. POWER: I have not received an answer from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to the question which I put to him in reference to the time of the year at which the Militia regiments in Ireland are called out for training. At present they are called out at a time when there is no dearth of agricultural employment; and I think it would be of great advantage to the men themselves and their families if the Government would make an arrangement by which in future the training should take place at a time when it is more difficult to find employment—namely, the early spring months.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I trust that if I do not answer every observation of every hon. Member who may address the Committee, any neglect on my part will not be construed into an act of disrespect. I waited until I thought every hon. Member who wished to speak upon the Vote had addressed the Committee, and the hon. Gentleman did not rise until after I had completed my reply. In regard to the subject to which he has called attention, I can only say that the Militia are called out for training at that period of the year which, in the judgment of the officer commanding the district, is deemed to be the best suited. I must remind the hon. Member that due regard must be had to the exposure of the regiment; and the months of February and March are not those months of the year which are best suited, even in Ireland, for bringing men together and training them in the open air. Apart from that, there is always a strong desire to call out the regiments at times when it is considered that the training will interfere as little as possible with the civil occupation of the men.

Dr. TANNER: I should like to ask whether Captain Somerset Maxwell applied for leave of absence in writing?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I really know nothing whatever about the circumstances of the case.

An hon. Member: I find that in the Island of Lewis there are about 800 Militiamen; and I find, further, that they are sent all the way to Fort George to be trained. A considerable amount of time is wasted in consequence, and there is also a large expense incurred. In other years we have been able to train and drill the Militia in Stornoway, and I believe the training could still be carried on there with ease. I want to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to this consideration—whether he does not think that there ought to be a centre at which these men could be trained? I am aware that there are objections to this; but if the loss of time and the difference between local training and the system which I propose be taken into account, I think the right hon. Gentleman would see that an advantage would result to the Public Service. I would also point out that if there were a training ship stationed there, you would get as many boys as you liked for the Naval Service.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £36,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): We have had some very valuable suggestions made by Gentlemen opposite as to reforms which might take place in the Service; but the difficulty is always in getting money for carrying out those reforms. I think the best way would be for hon. Members opposite to join Gentlemen on this side of the House in getting rid of some of the items of this wasteful expenditure. I am about to move an Amendment to the present Vote, which, I am sorry to say, has been reduced by the Vote taken on Account from £76,000 to £36,000. I think that hon. Gentlemen will agree with me that a more utterly wasteful expenditure than this £76,000 for the Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances cannot be imagined. For what is this Yeomanry? There is generally a regiment of Yeomanry Cavalry in each county; the country gentlemen become officers in it, and the troopers are, as a rule, their tenants and others connected with them. Once a year they come together for eight days' regimental training, and, besides that, they have three days' troop drill in the year—at least, that is what it is supposed to be; but, if it be so, it is perfectly obvious that it is impossible to make a man in it a soldier, or to make a horse a Cavalry horse fit for service, by drilling them for eight days a-year. I have stated what the theory is; but, as a matter of fact, it will be found that the whole thing is a piece of humbug throughout. It generally happens that the trooper hires the horse for the day, and after eight days, thinking that he has done his duty, and kept well with the squire, he gives up the horse and goes away. I am informed that most of the horses which can stand fire are old cast-off troop horses. Now, I ask what in the world is the good of a force like this? No doubt, if the country was invaded, you would require some sort of Cavalry for defensive purposes; but I think that any General commanding, under the circumstances, would be very careful to see that the Yeomanry Cavalry were kept out of the way. They are not much good for reconnoitring purposes; and where you have, as in this country, a large number of persons fond of such exercises, you would have no difficulty in getting the right sort of men for your purpose. I find that there is also a charge of £2,000 per annum for retired Yeomanry Cavalry officers, and I point out that this Vote of £78,000 would almost give that Capitation Grant to the Volunteers which is so much wanted. The question is, how you are best to employ money voted for military purposes? I think most hon. Gentlemen will agree with me that it would be better to employ the amount of this Vote on the Volunteers than maintaining an inefficient Yeomanry. Under the circumstances, I ask the House to vote against this Estimate.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 155; Noes 64: Majority 91.—(Div. List, No. 13.)

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £304,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman in charge of this Estimate whether there should appear a charge on account of the Clerks of Lieutenancy? We could understand that there should be this charge in connection with the Militia and Yeomanry; but I am bound to say that I see no ground why there should be a charge of £2,500 a-year for the payment of the Clerks of Lieutenancy on account of the Volunteer Corps. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will state what these clerks have to do in connection with the Volunteer Corps.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): There are some other observations which I shall have to reply to before the question of the hon. Member.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North West): I have to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War two questions upon this Vote. The first is, whether he has taken into consideration the question of an extra Capitation Grant; and whether he has received from officers of Volunteers the statement which the late Secretary of State for War applied for to each of those officers; and if he has carefully considered those statements with a view to coming to a final decision upon the subject? I am sure it will be a fair and careful decision; but time is going on, and the Volunteers are anxious to know what they are to expect during the coming year. The next question has reference to the Code of Instruction in Musketry. The Code of Instruction in Musketry has been entirely altered recently — that is to say, in the middle of the year—and it is stated that the alterations are to come into force immediately they are received. It will be a very hard case for some regiments, who have possibly completed their instruction, to go through another course after that which they have already gone through. Therefore, I would ask whether it would not be more wise and fair towards the Volunteer Force that the new Rules should not come into force until next year? I believe that will give satisfaction to this branch of the Service.

COLONEL LAURIE (Bath): I concur with the hon. and gallant Member who has just spoken in thinking that the new musketry instruction should not come into operation before the end of the present Volunteer year. The right hon. Gentleman will agree with me that the musketry instructions are only a part of the Volunteer drill.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I have to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War whether he contemplates the establishment of a Volunteer Force in Ireland? [*A laugh.*] Hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway laugh at this question; but probably they are not aware that, in a former Parliament, a Bill was passed through this House for the purpose of establishing a Volunteer Force in Ireland, although it was opposed in "another place." I have no doubt that, if a Bill were again introduced here, it would be passed and sent forward in like manner. The Volunteer Bill to which I allude was brought in by an Irish Member, and received the support of Members on both sides of the House at the time, and was passed through this House by a considerable majority. I believe that the main objection urged against the establishing of a Volunteer Force in Ireland is that the loyalty of the people is to be doubted. But, if the Irish people are disloyal, how is it that you can trust 53,000 Militiamen in Ireland to carry arms—how is it that you can trust these men, who are not usually drawn from the more respectable and orderly classes from which the Volunteer Forces would be drawn? I hold that the argument of assumed disloyalty on the part of the Irish people has no force whatever, and is refuted by the fact that you have already a large force in Ireland under arms, not only for the defence of your Home Possessions, but for the purpose of drawing thence your very best Army Reserve men. I say that the best of your Reserve men are those recruited from the Irish Militia; and I say that you knew this when you were in trouble some time ago and expected war between this country and Russia, for no men returned with more readiness to the Colours than did the Army Reserve men who were drawn from the Irish Militia. I repeat that the argument as to disloyalty does not weigh in this question; and I regret that some hon. and gallant Members from the North of Ireland are not present to add their testimony to this fact. It appears to me to be a palpable injustice that you should afford to the people of England and Scotland an opportunity of indulging in the pleasure and pastime of playing at soldiers, and that you should deprive a military nation like the Irish nation of this exceeding great pleasure. I believe that one of the chief mistakes which the Government of England has committed in its dealing with Ireland is, that it has not yielded to and encouraged its peculiarities. In Scotland you encourage the people to dress in the Celtic costume, and you allow them to indulge in their pastime of playing at soldiers—in short, you encourage their every national proclivity. Why have you not done so in Ireland? This has been a very one-sided policy on your part; and I believe the sooner it is abandoned the better it will be, and that the more you conciliate the Irish people the more you will attach them to yourselves. I ask whether the Government will consider the advisability of establishing in Ireland a Volunteer Force, which I believe would be conducive both to the interest of Ireland, and favourable to other conditions that we hope to see in existence.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): There is a matter connected with this Vote to which I have on former occasions alluded; and although something has been done in the direction indicated, still something more is required. I refer to the expenses of officers which are incurred by them in going through their tactical examination. During past years officers desiring to go through these examinations have been required to travel long distances at considerable cost to themselves, while no allowance whatever is made to them for expenses thus incurred in rendering themselves efficient. I was told on a former occasion that something would be done, and that it was intended that examinations in tactics should be held elsewhere than at the district centres. So far as that was carried out it was an improvement; but I am informed that officers are still put to a considerable expense in going through these examinations. They do feel it is rather hard they should be required to incur expense in proving their higher qualifications for the service of the country, and I suggest that when officers are required to leave their homes for the purpose of passing examinations, some allowance should be made to them.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am afraid I can give the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) no other explanation than that given by my hon. Friend the Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Brodrick). I will, however, look at the Act of Parliament, and if it is possible to effect a reduction it shall be made. With regard to the question raised by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for North-West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) as to the Returns made by officers commanding Volunteer Corps, I am sorry to say we have not even yet received the whole of these Returns; there are some 20 officers who had not yet sent in their Returns. We are taking steps with a view to ascertain what the real necessities of the corps are, and anything we find really necessary for the efficiency of the corps will not escape the attention of the Department. I am afraid I cannot go further than that at the present time. My hon. and gallant Friend knows that examinations of this kind require great care and consideration. We have asked for assistance in that examination, and I have no doubt the result will turn out to be satisfactory. My hon. and gallant Friend, and my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath (Colonel Laurie) referred to the musketry instructions this year. I was unaware of the effect of the regulations; but I fully realize what the hon. and gallant Gentlemen have said, and I will look into the matter and endeavour, as far as possible, to obviate any of the inconvenient results which it has been suggested may follow from them. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) referred to the old question of establishing a Volunteer Force in Ireland. I can quite understand the feeling with which the hon. Gentleman raised the question; but I am sure he does not expect from me a statement now that Her Majesty's Government are prepared at once to introduce a Bill to authorize the raising of Volunteer Corps in Ireland. The question shall have consideration, for I assure the hon. Gentleman that we are as desirous as he himself can be to provide for the people of Ireland the excitement and interest which he considers military exercises afford. The hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Tomlinson) referred to the facilities for technical examination offered to Volunteer officers. I will look into that question, and if it is possible to afford Volunteer officers greater facilities in this respect they shall be afforded.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): In this Estimate there is one very remarkable item, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman may be able to throw some light upon it. I find that the pay of the adjutants of Volunteers is increased this year by the amount of £2,600. Of course we know that the adjutant of a Volunteer corps is practically the working officer on the staff of the corps, and that the next most important men to him in respect to the instruction of the corps are the sergeant instructors. Now, I find that the pay of the sergeant instructors of Volunteers has diminished by the amount of £1,500, and I confess I do not see how the two items dove-tail. In fact, instead of dove-tailing, they show that there is something radically wrong. The pay of the adjutants is increased, whereas that of the men who really instruct the Volunteers is diminished by £1,500. I should be glad to receive some explanation upon this point.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will at the same time also explain why it is that the Isle of Man has to pay to this Exchequer £200 a year for the privilege of having Volunteers?

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): I have no objection to the enrolment of Volunteers generally; but I consider it is very unfair that Ireland should be deprived of the right of having Volunteers. In late debates in this House challenges to us were thrown out by very distinguished persons. We were called cowards, and asked why we did not fight as the Hungarians and the Italians fought. After all the bombast about fighting which we have heard in the House of Commons, it seems to me strange that when we demand the ordinary right of citizens to be put on an equality with England and Scotland in respect to the enrolment of Volunteers, we should be denied the right. Liberality of view upon all questions was one of the chief characteristics of the Irish Volunteers of old. Many quotations have been made in this House to show the liberality of the Protestant Volunteers. Whether on the Religious Question, the Free Trade Question, or the question of Native Government in Ireland, the Volunteers of Ireland showed themselves to be a body of men who were only anxious for the public good and the welfare and interest of their country. We hear a great deal from time to time about Free Trade. Are hon. Members aware that it was in Ireland that the question was first raised, and that the strongest supporters of Free Trade principles were the Irish Volunteers? They wrote upon the mouths of their cannon—"Free Trade, or else ——!" And though the English may be inclined to ignore and disregard the sentiments of these men, we in Ireland have a very clear recollection of them, and we value them very highly. As to Volunteer corps generally, it is most desirable that there should be such bodies of men in any country. Every citizen should have the right to carry arms; if occasion arose, every citizen should fight for his country. How can men fight if they do not know how to fight? How can they fight if they have no arms, and if they have not been drilled? How can they fight if they get no opportunities? We in Ireland do not only complain that we are denied the right to become Volunteers, but that we are also not allowed to carry arms. These grievences are felt very keenly in Ireland. If you want to conciliate the people of Ireland, you must conciliate them upon some liberal principle—upon the principle of equality and right. Unless you do that, I fear the relations between this country and Ireland will go on from bad to worse.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. Friend the Member for Galway (Mr. Harris), because I look upon this sum of money which we are now asked to vote as money practically thrown away. We have had Volunteers in this country for many years, but as far as any fighting in connection with the country is concerned they appear to be perfectly worthless. I will show why, in my opinion, they are worthless. If the Volunteers are ever to be of any value, it will be in case of foreign invasion. Now, I should like to know whether there is any commissariat department in connection with the Volunteers, and whether the Volunteer corps have had any training which would make them of the slightest value in case of actual warfare? I am inclined to think that, in case of an invasion of the country, a large number of the Volunteers would make themselves very scarce. Of course, it is very good amusement for men to dress up in regimentals; besides, the movement gives an opportunity to a certain portion of the population to pose as military captains and majors and colonels. If I were a military man, I really would protest very strongly against this system of allowing men to use military titles, men who are in reality only amateurs, who, in point of fact, are not soldiers at all. Unless some explanation of the Vote is given by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War of a very much more satisfactory nature than I expect he can possibly give, I shall move to reduce the Vote and divide the Committee on the subject.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardine): I entirely disagree with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) upon this question. I think the Volunteers are a very admirable force, and I only wish we had 300,000 or 400,000 under arms. I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will treat them generously.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Mayo, S.): It is not necessary to tell hon. Gentlemen that Ireland is a very poor country. Everything appears to be done which prevents the progress of the country; money is drawn away from Ireland, but nothing is done to spend any there. In this country Volunteering affords considerable amusement for the people; besides which, a very large sum of money is spent annually in the maintenance of the force. Nothing is spent in Ireland upon such a force, neither does the country get anything in the way of an equivalent. I really think that until we can get a Volunteer Force in Ireland, we at least ought to receive an equivalent in the outlay of money. That is a very fair proposition. If we are to be deprived of the pleasure and glory of a Volunteer Force, we ought to be given some equivalent.

MR. ISAACS (Newington, Walworth): Although the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) has criticized the Volunteer Force of this country in no friendly spirit, he has, I think, done it a large amount of good. The hon. Gentleman called attention to the commissariat and transport, in respect of which the Volunteers of the country stand in great need. I trust that when the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War is preparing the Army Estimates next year he will consider whether he can afford to give the very modest sum in the way of an increase in the capitation grant asked for by the Volunteers,—namely, 10*s*. per head. I am in a position to say that if this increase in the grant were made, the Volunteers would be able to put themselves in a proper position with regard to commissariat and transport, and to befit themselves to take part in any military proceedings which might be necessary for the defence of the country. It is too late in the day for hon. Members to question the value of the Volunteers. It has been recognized on all hands that the Volunteers of this country form a very reliable force; military experts have borne testimony to the excellent qualities of the force. I regret that circumstances will not permit the establishment of Volunteer regiments in Ireland; but the regiments that are embodied in this country and in Scotland are admitted to be composed of men of excellent qualities, well calculated to give good service if ever they are called upon. I trust that when the next Estimates are being prepared, the question of providing the Volunteers with proper commissariat and transport will be favourably considered by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I wish to say that if my hon. Friend (Mr. Biggar) goes to a division I shall feel bound to follow him into the Lobby. As I do not disapprove of the Volunteer Force in general, it is necessary I should say a few words to justify the vote I intend to give. I have asked that the War Department should consider the advisability of establishing a Volunteer Force in Ireland. In consequence of the unfavourable answer I received from the right hon. Gentleman—in consequence of the inequality that is kept up with regard to the establishment of Volunteer Forces in England and Ireland—I have resolved to support the proposition of the hon. Member for Cavan. I do not wish to depreciate the character of the Volunteer Force. I have great respect for the character of the Volunteer Force of this country, and for the character of the Volunteer Force in every country. Your Volunteer Force was established in the time of the Napoleonic Wars—a Volunteer Force was established then. I do not know whether the present one is a continuance of that or not. Volunteer Forces in every country have done the main portion of the military work of the country in which they are enrolled. They were Volunteer Forces who fought the best battles of the American War; they were Volunteer Forces who won the only victory that was achieved by the French in the late Franco-German War; and I believe that, with very little training, Volunteer Forces may be made very effective in the field. We all remember reading the account of the *Battle of Dorking*. It was admitted by the anonymous writer that while the Volunteer Forces of England were not the best for manœuvering, they were, at least in the opinion of the supposed German invaders, very good shots. That, I believe, no person will deny—the Volunteers of England are very good shots indeed. They are material out of which good forces may be made, and I shall not depreciate them. However, I intend to vote against the Establishment, not because I have any hostility to the Volunteer Force of this country or of any country, but because I wish to mark my disapproval of the unequal manner in which the War Department, as well as every other Department of Government, treats the country of which I am a Representative.

MR. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn): I desire to impress upon the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for

War a matter which I think has escaped his attention. A question was asked him just now with regard to the capitation grant to Volunteers, but the right hon. Gentleman made no reply to it. I do appeal to him with regard to the subject. There is a very strong feeling, indeed, amongst Volunteers that the capitation grant should be increased, and it is hoped that we may receive some assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that Her Majesty's Government will look upon the matter with some favour. A statement of that kind would be a great encouragement to the Volunteers in the performance of their duty. I trust the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) will not think it proper to divide the Committee upon this Vote. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. O'Connor) who has just addressed the Committee has given a most extraordinary reason for supporting the hon. Member for Cavan in his opposition to the Vote. The hon. Gentleman says he is in favour of Volunteers in general, but he is going in the Lobby against the Vote for the purpose of satisfying, as far as I understand him, some feeling that Ireland should be allowed to enrol Volunteers. I think it would be well if the hon. Gentleman had a little patience. It is useless to put us to the trouble of a division. Many of us are in favour of the establishment of Volunteer corps in Ireland, and no doubt they will, in due course, be established.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I do not think that the criticism which has been founded upon the argument of the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) is at all a fair one. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Anderson) may or may not be aware that it is not within our power to propose any Vote for Ireland, and that the only way in which we can possibly show our objection to the present system, the only way in which we can enter a protest against the distribution of the public funds in favour of England and against Ireland, is by opposing the Vote for this country. I must say I am in favour of Volunteers rather than otherwise. I myself was a Volunteer once. I joined the force principally with the idea that possibly some day or other my training might be of use to Ireland. But I do not look upon the Volunteer movement from a military point of view only. The hygienic and social effects of the movement have been very valuable to this country. Such an obvious accompaniment of the Volunteer movement as the early closing movement shows the important social effect of volunteering. Now, that is one of the advantages which England has enjoyed in consequence of the privilege allowed her which has been denied to Ireland. There is a very marked distinction between a provincial town in England and a provincial town in Ireland in this respect. In many of the towns in Ireland there is on a Saturday afternoon nothing of the kind you find here—most of the shops shut and people turning out for what is really a half-holiday. The Volunteer movement has certainly been of great use in respect to the health of the nation, and if it were only on that account I think the Volunteer system ought to be extended far beyond the limits which it has at present reached. There are tens of thousands of working men in this country who would make very good Volunteers — who would certainly be benefited by the drills and the outdoor exercise on the Saturday afternoons if only they were placed in a position to avail themselves of the movement. They cannot do it. There is a certain amount of expense inseparable from joining the Volunteers; and so far from opposing the Vote I should be disposed strongly to support a very considerable extension of it, in order that hundreds and thousands of men, not only in London, but also in the Black Country—in Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and other Midland counties—should be enabled to equip as far as necessary, take part in the movement, and have the hygienic advantages of the drill. But I must say that I am astonished that any English Member should take it ill that we object to the distribution of this £800,000 a-year in Great Britain when we are refused a single farthing for a like Service in Ireland. There is absolutely no reason for refusing it. As has been pointed out, you are already prepared to trust with arms men in the lowest social stratum—in the Militia, but you hestitate to allow the enrolment of Volunteers—men who occupy very much higher social positions and men who are perfectly prepared to give you every assurance you exact from your Volunteers in this country. Under these circumstances, if my hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr.

Biggar) finds himself constrained to go into the Division Lobby I shall find myself constrained to follow his whip. But, as I have said before, I doubt whether there is any practical advantage in our doing so. We have protested against this Vote year after year, and taken divisions upon it. The hon. Member (Mr. Anderson) has told us it will all come in due time; but we have no indication that we are a bit nearer the establishment of Voluntер corps in Ireland now than we were 15 years ago.

MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.): We are asked to vote something over £600,000 for Volunteers in England, Scotland, and Wales. An hon. Member above the Gangway has told us that we in Ireland have 20,000 Regular troops in our country, and that that ought to be considered as some recompense for the absence of Volunteer corps. But what are the troops in Ireland and what are they doing? They are not purely Irish troops, and, as we have seen within the last month, they have been employed in rendering assistance at evictions. I will not, however, discuss that question now. The Committee are asked to vote this large sum of money to be expended in England and Scotland, and we in Ireland are to receive nothing as an equivalent. If we were allowed to enrol Volunteers we should be only too willing to contribute our proportion of this Vote. Inasmuch as we are not allowed that privilege I shall go into the Lobby with my hon. Friend the Member for Cavan.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I am strongly inclined to support the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cavan. I consider, from all I have heard in relation to the Volunteer Force in England, that for the purpose of actual warfare they are comparatively worthless, and if they are comparatively worthless the money expended upon them is thrown away. In my opinion they are simply amateurs. But we have heard from an hon. Member opposite (Mr. Isaacs) that they are very valuable as a military force; but I question that, and I do not think the hon. Member has any *data* on which to make that statement. The Volunteers, as an army of defence or offence, have never been tested, and until they have been we cannot say for certain that they do constitute a valuable force; we do not know whether, if occasion arose, they might not be found running away like as in another Bull's Run instead of defending the country. I know that it is a very valuable force for conferring titles upon different gentlemen. When first I heard the Speaker call upon Colonel So-and-so and Major So-and-so and Captain So-and-so, I really thought the Gentlemen had derived their titles from service in the Regular Army, and I was greatly taken aback when I was told that they merely derived their titles from the Volunteer Force. I really believe that that is mainly the ground upon which the Volunteer Force is defended by many hon. Gentlemen. If the Volunteer Force is to be maintained it should be extended to Ireland, and it lies upon the Tory Party to grant a Volunteer Force to Ireland. They have refused to give us many things that we want—they have refused to give us Home Rule, but they have always professed a desire to place Ireland on an equality with England. For these reasons I urge upon the Government and upon the House the desirability of granting to Ireland a Volunteer Force if they intend to maintain a Volunteer Force in England. I think it is very unfair that they should refuse to legislate equally all round. seeing that we in Ireland contribute a portion of the money to the maintenance of the Volunteer Force in England. This is clearly a case in which there should be an equality of legislation between the wo countries, and for that reason I shall feel it my duty to vote for the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Cavan.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I am afraid we are getting rather mixed up in this discussion, because we appear to be proceeding on two different lines. The first argument upon this Vote was urged by the hon. Member for Cavan. The hon. Member seems to think that a Volunteer Force would be of no use in Ireland. I will not, however, argue that point, although I may be permitted to say that I do not agree with him in that opinion. For a considerable portion of my life I have had experience as a Volunteer, and I am perfectly certain that a Volunteer Force is a practical gain and benefit to the country in which it exists. On the other hand, I agree with the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. John O'Connor) in the view he has taken, and I think our best course would be to have two divisions, one upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Cavan, and the other on the issue raised by my hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary—namely, that the fact that a Volunteer Force is not granted to Ireland constitutes a great grievance. My hon. Friend asks why, when a Volunteer Force is granted to England, to Wales, and to Scotland, Ireland should be left out of the category? We have had a prolonged discussion on the Militia. Now, Sir, I have never heard the same points urged against the Volunteer Force as we hear urged against the Militia. You have both forces in this country, and I have never heard it said with regard to Volunteers, as has been said in the case of the Militia, that the officers were unable to carry pocket-handkerchiefs owing to the felonious propensities of the rank and file. I should be only too happy to support the Amendment which my hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary will, I hope, move; but, at the same time, I must say that I cannot go into the Lobby with the hon. Member for Cavan.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): I wish to observe that there is no doubt whatever with regard to the efficiency of the Volunteer Force; and I am convinced that, with a very few few weeks' training, the great majority of the regiments of the Volunteers would be able to take their places in the Line with Her Majesty's Regular Forces, and that any Foreign Power which should measure that force at anything less than the number of bayonets of which it is composed would make a very grave mistake.

MR. BYRNE (Wicklow): I object to this Vote on several grounds. First of all, this is a Vote to keep up a force of Volunteers for England alone; and the people of Ireland object to bear any portion of the expense. Another ground of objection is, that we are not allowed to have a similar force for our protection. Again, I say that the system of getting up the Volunteer movement is not an efficient one—usually two or three gentlemen get together and start a movement, and these gentlemen become the officers of the regiment. Now, Sir, in the selection of officers you want efficiency; but I have known officers who, if they were required to shoot at an enemy from the distance at which I am from the Chair, could not see him. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that at this distance they would not be able to distinguish you from another Member of the House. My next point is, that money enters too much into this question. I was myself asked in one case for £1,200, and for what? That I might become a full-blown colonel. I am speaking now in the interest of the people of England. I say that the object of having Volunteers is the protection of people at home, and that efficiency ought to be the first qualification for every officer of Volunteers. But I have known cases where the uniform was the attraction and not the Service. I believe that there are amongst the Volunteer officers men who, if you were to go to war to-morrow, could not ride a horse at all. I believe that men have been made officers who have passed through no test whatever as to qualifications, and of this I can give many instances. I repeat that so long as you have Volunteers you ought to have officers who are thoroughly efficient, and the rule should be laid down in every case that before this position is attained the men should be in all respects capable of performing their duties. As I have said, the money qualification has a great deal to do with the position of officers in the Volunteer Force, and I am convinced that unless a man is rich it is impossible for him to get on the officers' list. I have heard of colonels and officers being obliged to pay for the clothing of the men as well as incur other heavy expenses; and, with these facts before me, I say that we ought to have a promise from the Minister in charge of these Estimates that, so long as the Volunteer Force has to be paid for by the people, the first consideration shall be the efficiency of the officers.

MR. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I have a ground of objection to this Vote different from that of my hon. Friend who has just sat down. It is that the Volunteers have not only a military spirit but an aggressive spirit. My belief is that England is too warlike a nation. The people of England are continually making war, and I think that this warlike spirit is injurious to a people who should devote themselves to commerce and peaceful pursuits. They already rule one-fifth of the human race, and they are still dissatisfied unless they have a war with some people on hand.

This aggressive spirit requires watering down.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): I think that there are very few Members in this House who will agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken in saying that the Volunteer Force cultivates an aggressive and warlike spirit. Their motto, we must all remember, is "Defence, not defiance." I will not enter into the arguments adduced by hon. Members below the Gangway, but simply express a hope that the Amendment before the Committee will not be pressed to a division, because I think those hon. Members ought to feel that the Volunteer Force is equally in favour with all Parties in the House. I represent a Radical constituency in the Midlands, and I can assure hon. Members that the Volunteers are very much in favour with us. When the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Estimates replies on this Vote, I hope to hear that Her Majesty's Government have seen their way to an extension of the capitation grant.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.): I cannot agree with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Channing) that it is the duty of Irish Members to support this Vote because it is in favour with various Parties in the House. The first duty of hon. Members who sit upon these Benches is to see that the money to which the people of Ireland contribute is spent in the interest of their country. The Volunteers may be a very efficient and useful force; but seeing that the Irish people derive no benefit and get no equivalent for the money which they pay to the Imperial Exchequer for the maintenance of that force, I think it is monstrous that they should continue to be taxed for that purpose, and, therefore, I shall certainly vote for the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Cavan.

MR. BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I merely wish to protest against what appears to me to be an unjust attack upon the Volunteers as a body in this country. I do not know what the experience of the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. Byrne) may be in such matters; but I should have thought that he would have been better qualified to speak on many other subjects. But a great deal of the indignation felt in matters of this kind sometimes arises from ignorance alone—["Question!"]—and I think there are very few Members in this House besides the hon. Member who cries "Question!" who are not aware that it has always been insisted on that officers in the Volunteer Force should give proof of their efficiency, not only before being promoted, but before being permitted to retain the rank they already hold. I will not insult the intelligence of the Committee by going into details of the question, because it is well known to everyone who is acquainted with the subject, that the case is as I have stated it. I have said enough to show that the opinion that the efficiency of officers of Volunteers is not attended to is entirely erroneous. With regard to the other point raised by the hon. Member, I am, of course, quite as anxious as he is for a small extension of the capitation grant.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I regret that I cannot accede to the appeal made on both sides of the House with regard to this Vote. I should like to oblige the hon. Member above the Gangway (Mr. Channing), who represents a Radical constituency, for I feel that both he and his constituents, looking at this matter as we do ourselves, will desire that justice should be done to Ireland. I trust that our Motion will go to the country in its true light, and that the people of this country will understand that it is in no unfriendly spirit that we make that Motion. I trust, too, that the constituencies in which Volunteers abound will make their voice heard at the next Elections, and that at the polls they will exercise their priviledges as citizens with a view of doing justice to Ireland in this matter. I shall move that this Vote be reduced by the sum of £16,000, being the increase in the capitation grant for the year 1886-7 over the year 1885-6, which will be found under Sub-head C.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £288,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."—(*Mr. John O'Connor.*)

MR. W. H. SMITH: In reply to the inquiry as to the cause of the increase in the cost of the force, I may say that it is due to an increase in the number of adjutants with increased pay. There is also an increase in the number of sergeant instructors, which is a cause of the increased charge. The cost of clothing is also charged; formerly an allowance coming under another Vote. With regard to an Irish Volunteer Force, I hope that hon. Members opposite will not think me wanting in respect to them when I say that I have not the power to propose a Vote for the establishment of a Volunteer Force in Ireland. The establishment of a Volunteer Force in Ireland can only take place by Act of Parliament, and therefore I hope hon. Members will see that it is impossible for me to make any promise with regard to this matter.

Mr. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.): I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee to one thing which strikes me as being very peculiar and unsatisfactory. That is the reduction which has been made in the number of Mounted Riflemen. I have heard the opinion repeatedly expressed by military men of considerable experience that if there is one respect in which the Volunteer Force would be most efficient and serviceable, it would be in assisting the Regular Army as scouts; and I believe, Sir, if more attention were paid to this branch of the Service, it would be a great benefit to the country. I should like to know how it is that the number of Mounted Riflemen is so small? It cannot be that there is want of wealth in the country, and it cannot be that the young men of the middle class are averse from exercises in the open air, because, to their credit be it spoken, the young men of England are as efficient in rowing, cricket, and sports of that character as the men of any country in the world, and I do not see why they should not furnish a very valuable and large contingent to the country in the shape of Mounted Riflemen and Light Horsemen. There has been some reference this evening to the fact that Ireland has not the benefit of a Volunteer Force at the present time. In the Volunteer Force which Ireland had in the latter part of the last century, the mounted portion of the force were both numerous and highly efficient. It was said of them that the Mounted Volunteer Corps in Ireland were superior to the Regular Cavalry, because they were better mounted, and the men were accustomed to ride across country, and were able to keep their seats better than the Cavalry soldiers, who were merely trained to do the regulation work. It was also notorious that the gentlemen of Ireland were good shots with the pistol at that time. I should like to have from the right hon. Gentleman some explanation as to the miserably small number of Mounted Rifles and Light Horsemen in the Service.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I do not object to the Volunteers as Volunteers, and I do not find fault with them with regard to the point of efficiency they have reached. But I look upon them as an isolated force, having no cohesion with the other branches of the Service. At the same time, I believe that in actual war they could not co-operate with the active portion of the Army. With regard to the increase of the capitation grant which has been asked for, I am of opinion that there is either too much done for the Volunteers already, or very much too little. I believe that more money should be spent in making Volunteers efficient, instead of giving large sums to colonels of regiments, and allowing it to be squandered, which I think is a very objectionable proceeding. If the money were spent under the direction of the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces, for the purpose of making Volunteers a really efficient branch of the Service of the country, then I think we should be thoroughly justified in providing a much larger sum; but, at present, I think the money spent on the Volunteer Force is entirely thrown away, unless we intend to make them more efficient and put them into a higher grade in the Service. For these reasons I feel it my duty to support the Motion of the hon. Member for Tipperary.

An hon. Member: I cannot agree with the opinions which have been expressed with regard to the Volunteer Force by some of my hon. Friends, because I think that this force, having regard to the men and money spent on it, is one of the most efficient in the country. My feeling is that the force has not received an adequate amount of support, and for that reason I must oppose the Motion of my hon. Friend.

Mr. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I think that some hon. Gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House do not quite understand our position. Our position is based upon this—that while Volunteers are paid for the defence of England and Scotland, no similar provision is made for Ireland, and that we are called upon, nevertheless, to contribute from our taxation to the maintenance of the force. I cannot agree with the opinion that the Volunteers in England are efficient, because those who know anything about military affairs, at least in action, know that they are not efficient. The Volunteers are an admirable war material, and might be made an available adjunct to the Forces of the Empire; but the fact is that, at present, they are not so, and there is no doubt that a great deal of the money spent upon them is wasted. I am old enough to remember the beginning of the movement, and I can say from my own observation that the Volunteer corps are not much better now than they were 20 years ago. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite say "Oh, oh!" That is a matter of opinion, no doubt, but it is the opinion which I hold. I am sorry that the Secretary of State for War has not seen his way to give us some promise that the Government will take into consideration the establishment of a Volunteer Force in Ireland. The Volunteer Force was established in view of certain eventualities, and if these eventualities arise, Ireland will not have the same protection as England or Scotland. We are in this position—for 20 years we have contributed to the maintenance of a force for the defence of your country and your homes, and yet you leave us, who are in a more exposed position than you are, entirely without defence. A great deal of Army expenditure which is made with the view to eventualities is laid out in this country, but very little of that money is spent in Ireland. Under these circumstances, I think we are justified in making a protest against a continuance of this policy, and, at the same time, it is our duty to see that the Volunteer Force should be made efficient. With regard to the point raised by my hon. Friend the Member for North Louth (Mr. Nolan), of course the Cavalry Volunteer Force is ridiculously small, and could be of no real service in war. I think it is the duty of the Government, if they want to go on spending money in the maintenance of the Volunteer Force, to see that the money is spent in making it really available for the country in actual war. Under these circumstances, I shall feel it my duty to support the Motion before the Committee.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.): I think it right to say that, in my opinion, Ireland is as good a country as any other country under the Crown, and, therefore, finding that Ireland is treated unfairly by not allowing it to have the advantage of a Volunteer Force, I must, on behalf of my constituents, support this Motion.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 55; Noes 150: Majority 95.—(Div. List, No. 14.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(7.) £223,000, to complete the sum for the Army Reserve Force.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I should like to ask if the Representative of the War Office can say what is the present distribution of the Army Reserve Force—that is to say, how many men of the First Class Army Reserve are serving in Ireland, and how many of the second class?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am afraid I cannot give the information asked for. I can tell the hon. Member for East Donegal how many Reserve men there are altogether, but not how many there are in the two countries respectively. I will, however, inquire into the matter, and endeavour to answer the hon. Gentleman on Report.

GENERAL FRASER (Lambeth, N.): I should like to be permitted to say upon this Vote that the expenditure upon the Cavalry Reserve is, in the opinion of Cavalry officers, an expenditure that is neither advantageous for the Cavalry nor for the country. It is a well-known fact that a Cavalry man who has been away from his regiment for a lengthened time is useless, and yet, since the establishment of the Reserves, there has been great pressure brought to bear to induce men to leave the Cavalry and join the Reserve Force. So great was the pressure that, in one instance, 45 men were induced to leave their regiment before they had served the time they had engaged to serve, and they thus threw additional work upon their comrades, 12 of whom deserted the next month. The

Lancer regiment that was sent out to the campaign at Suakin, the full complement of which was 469, received in 18 months no less than 252 recruits. The good soldiers, the highly-trained horsemen, the men who could handle the lance, sword, and carbine effectively, and who knew how to scour a country, were sent into the Reserve—sent into the Reserve to live on the small pay allowed them by the country, for, in many instances, they found themselves quite unable to obtain any civil employment. In their place raw recruits were sent out. To send out men who are not trained to scour a country, who do not know how to back each other up and act in concert, in front of an enemy, is really to sacrifice good lives, with no result but discredit and disaster. I say, and I challenge anyone to refute my statement, that there is no regiment of Cavalry in Her Majesty's Service that is fit in men and horses to take part in or to do its duty in a campaign. The regiments that are most efficient, according to their establishments, are the three regiments of Horse Guards. Therefore, I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will take the great question of the Cavalry Reserve into his serious consideration.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West): Mr. Courtney, I look upon this Vote as one of the most important Votes that we have to consider. It is a Vote upon which I have always made some remarks; and I venture to say that never in our history was the question of our Reserve more important than it is at the present moment. The question of the Reserve is intimately bound up with the question of recruiting. I do not think that my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War will for a moment contend that the waste in the Army, which, I am sorry to say, is still going on, has not a material effect upon the Reserve of the Army. When the short-service system was established, we were told that in a very short time we should have a very large Reserve indeed. I am glad to say that the Reserve is creeping up, though only in small proportions. I see that the Reserve of the Army of to-day numbers 41,889 men, and that the Militia Reserve numbers 30,128 men, making a total of 72,017 men. Now, I think that this Reserve ought to be an absolute Reserve, and one that we should hold in readiness for great emergencies. The question of recruiting, and the question of the depletion of regiments at home, are so intimately bound up with the Reserve in all its bearings that I will venture to make a few remarks in regard to it. No one knows better than the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) that when we deplete regiments at home, as we have had to do during the time of any of the small wars in which we have been engaged, when we send out all the best men in the regiment at home to serve in India or elsewhere, and to keep up to the mark the regiments abroad we leave the regiments at home in an absolutely indefensible condition, and the consequence is that the very moment we call out the regiments at home and send them away, as we did to Egypt a short time ago, and as we may very shortly have to do to the East, we find we have to draw upon our Reserve to make the regiments we are sending abroad efficient. I maintain that that is a false system, and that our regiments at home ought to be in themselves efficient. How is that to be accomplished? How are we to arrive at that very desirable state of things? Let us look at the recruiting statistics for last year. We got last year 39,971 recruits. It is natural to suppose that in consequence of the depression of trade, which has now existed for some years, we have of late received more recruits than we otherwise should have done. If things were in a more prosperous and flourishing condition than they have been during the last few years, we certainly should not have received anything like the number of recruits I have just quoted. But we want recruits to fill up the gaps in the Army, and the question for us is how we can make the Service so attractive as to get men to enter the ranks. In the first place, we should never deceive men in regard to rations. One of the first things that a man considers is what he is going to be given to eat; it may be a low consideration, but still it is one prompted by human nature. If a man has been told that he will have everything found him, and he then finds that he is required to pay for many things, he feels he has been taken in, and that the Service is not what it has been represented to him to be. This is a matter to which I particularly call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. If we are not going to give free rations; if we are only going to give 1 lb. of bread and ¾ lb. of meat per man per day, let us tell the men so. That is an honest and straightforward statement, but it is not the statement which is made in the papers distributed through the Post Office. I have heard it said that we should not get recruits if we were so candid as this. I say it is better not to get recruits than to get them under false pretences. The next important question is that of clothing. When they join the Service men expect they are going to receive a good outfit of clothing. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Lambeth (General Fraser), who has had a large number of battalions under his command from time to time, will bear me out when I say that instead of receiving a proper outfit on entering the Service men have had handed over to them clothing which is dirty, soiled, and perfectly unfit to be put on. The men become disgusted when they find that they are not fairly and properly clothed. I think that if the clothing served out were better then it is the effect upon the number of recruits would be very material. I pass on to another point. Every consideration should be paid to the men on joining the Service. I think my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) will bear me out when I say that it is important that the officers should deal with the recruits in a kind and lenient spirit. When a young horse is to be broken in the very best thing to do is to put a man on him who will treat him gently, but who, at the same time, will be firm with him. In the same way, if officers and non-commissioned officers will only deal with the recruits carefully and tenderly, I believe they will thus do a great deal to cause men to remain in the Army. Then there is another question which must be borne in mind. When a man joins a depôt he does not know which battalion of the regiment he is to be sent to. He may be required to serve with the battalion at home, or he may be sent out to India to serve with the battalion there. Surely where it can be managed a man should have his choice, or at any rate, if he cannot take his choice, he should be told he will have to go to the regiment in India or to remain at home. These things can very easily be managed with a little careful consideration, and attention to them would tend very much to facilitate recruiting, and to prevent the enormous waste we now find going on. But the great question is this, whether a man on first joining a depôt should be drilled at that depôt, or whether the regiment at home should drill its own recruits? Now, this is a matter which I commend to the attention of my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith). The practice now is that a man should be drilled with the depôt for three months, I think, and then sent to the regiment at home. The regiment at home takes him in hand for another month, and at the end of the four months he is supposed to know all his work. I should like to know what soldier—what ordinary Infantry soldier—the Cavalry soldier is drilled with his own regiment —can learn his duty in four months? Because we are short of men, having sent out a large number for foreign service, we put men, who very possibly have not undergone their musketry drill, to do guard and other duty. If recruits are sent to a garrison like Portsmouth they have very often to do guard duty, and get very little bed. We have been taking men at 17 years of age; and I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether a system by which men who have only been a very short time in the Service are kept out of their beds so frequently is one which is likely to tend to keep up the number of recruits? There is another point worthy of attention. It is a grave question whether a regiment at home should drill its own recruits, or whether the depôt should drill them on behalf of the regiment at home, as well as the regiment in India. If they do, the men ought to be there for not less than six months. The original proposal was that the Army should be increased by a certain number of men. Lord Wolseley contended that we ought not to have less than 10,000 men in hand in order to fill up any gaps which might from time to time occur. These are considerations which do deserve the serious attention of my right hon. Friend. The depôt centres ought to be very much increased, so as to give a sufficient number of recruits to the regiments at home and also in India. Of one thing I am certain, looking at the state of Europe at this particular moment, and that is that the regiments at home ought not to be denuded. What do you think the waste of the Army during this year is estimated at? Why, it is estimated at 32,000 men. And what do you think is the average transfer to the Reserve? I cannot make it out accurately, but the Inspector General of Recruiting estimates it at 8,820. He admits, and everyone admits, that the waste is one-sixth of the whole Army each year. Last year the desertions numbered 5,147, and of these men how many did we recover? Somewhere under 2,000, so that there was a net loss to the Service of 3,000. There were invalided 1,304 under three years' service; there were discharged for misconduct 1,008; there were discharged by purchase, at £10 a piece, 1,909. It is, perhaps, a very good thing to allow men to purchase their discharge if they do not like the Service. These men generally came in with the view and wish of liking the Service; but they find things so totally at variance with what they expected that they purchase their discharge. Well, now, last year a large number of men were called out from the Army Reserve. What is their complaint? There was a complaint, written in excellent language, by a soldier of the name of Edward Diblin, who formerly belonged to the 2nd Scottish Rifles. I am told, and my right hon. Friend will correct me if I am wrong, that an alteration has been made with regard to deferred pay, and that now if a man has spent any portion of his deferred pay he can still come back and continue his service. This is a very important matter; and I hope that my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith), when he comes to reply, will be able to state whether the men who get their deferred pay when they are transferred to the Reserve are able to spend it and then return to their regiment if it is their desire to do so. In his letter to *The Times* Diblin said he left his regiment in India in October, 1884, and was transferred to the Reserve. It being then winter, he could not obtain any employment until the spring. He was, with hundreds more, called back to service with the Colours in the spring of 1885, and detained all the summer. At the end of the summer the authorities had no use for the Reserve men, and, with another long winter staring them in the face, they were sent back. He had obtained comparatively little employment, and he believed that was the case with many others. When he told anyone to whom he applied for work that he was in the Reserve, the answer was—"I cannot employ you; you may be called upon to serve at any time." He believed there was an organization to find employment for men of the Reserve Forces; but although his name had been on its list for nearly two years it had failed to find him work. When he applied to rejoin the Colours he was told that his application could only be acceded to on condition that he refunded in one sum the deferred pay he had received on his transference to the Reserve. Now, all I have to ask in regard to this matter is—what are the men to do if they cannot get employment? How are they to live pending employment? What can they do but spend the deferred pay they have received on joining the Reserve? And is it not reasonable to suppose that if men on re-engaging are required to refund the deferred pay they had received, the services of many good men will be lost to the country? Men will say—"Deferred pay is a delusion and a snare, and we certainly shall not re-engage if we have to refund it." The question may be dealt with in many ways. I will not detain the Committee by discussing how it should be dealt with; but this I will say—that the question is one which vitally affects the recruiting for the Army, which vitally affects the Reserve, the success of which we have so much at heart; and, therefore, I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will give it his earnest attention, and deal with it in a way which will be satisfactory to the men who are anxious to re-engage, and also to the country. Now, Mr. Courtney, my hon. and gallant Friend (General Fraser) spoke about the Cavalry Reserve. There has been a good deal said about the Cavalry of this country. I know how difficult the question is to deal with; but do not let my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) suppose for one moment that he would do any good with the Cavalry if he were to break up the identity of the regiments. We have followed the example of Continental countries in regard to the Infantry Reserve, why not follow their example with respect to the Artillery and regiments of Cavalry? Continental countries always keep their Artillery and Cavalry up to war strength. Surely that is what a country like this ought to do. Our Cavalry is so small that it ought to be the most efficient in the world; and such efficiency can only be secured by being able to transport a regiment complete both in men and horses at a moment's notice. Besides being able to do that, we ought also to be able to leave a depôt capable of sending out from time to time men and horses sufficient to keep the regiment up to its original and proper strength. To amalgamate regiments of Cavalry is one of the greatest mistakes we can possibly make. Only let us follow the example of foreign countries and we shall do a great deal towards securing the efficiency of the Cavalry. The Artillery and Cavalry Reserves are most useful, though I fear that, when called upon, they will have to go into barracks to learn the duties they have forgotten. They are, however, most useful bodies to have in reserve; but what is really wanted first is that the regiments themselves should be efficient and perfect. One word more and I have done. I should like my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) to see we have that which all his Predecessors have said is necessary, and that is an Army Corps always ready to take the field. We should always have our First Army Corps at Aldershot, under the Generals who would command it if it were sent out on active service. Having regard to the complications all around us, to the numerous small wars in which we are called upon to engage, and to the great war which I fear is looming in the distance—I hope to God it is very distant—we ought not to spare the expense necessary to maintain our First Army Corps in the most efficient condition, and to have a Second Army Corps ready to take the place of the First when required.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): On all matters, but particularly on Army matters, this Committee always listens with the greatest interest to the speeches of the hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Walter B. Barttelot). His heart is bound up in the efficiency and welfare of the Army, and he always brings great knowledge to bear on the subject. I do not agree with him in everything, but I think I can agree in every word he has just uttered. He has drawn our attention to a most important subject, that of the Reserve. The fact is, we established the Reserve, upon the initiation of Mr. Cardwell, because every other country had a Reserve; but it has been kept up without any regard being had to the special circumstances of the country, and without following very closely the Continental example. Our Reserve is a good institution, but upon certain men it imposes, as it is now worked, a great deal of hardship. In respect to the Reserve, we neither follow the history of our own country nor the precedent set by foreign countries. We do not follow the precedent of foreign countries, because their Armies are very large; and we do not follow the history of our own country, because this country is dependent upon a small and efficient Army. The Reserve has prevented the Army being regarded by a private soldier as a profession. We have got an Army and a Reserve much smaller than those of Continental countries, and yet there is the disadvantage that the Army is no longer a profession for the private soldier. Until the adoption of the system of compulsory retirement, the Army was a profession for the private soldier; but it is no longer so. After a man has served a given time, he is put into the Reserve, on, I think, 4*d.* a-day. Of course, that is not sufficient to keep him. I, as Chairman of a large Union, have found that Reserve men very often come for relief of one form or another; indeed, the position of these men is not at all satisfactory. A good many of them get employment and work very hard, but not so with the whole of them. Twice in the last 10 or 12 years we have called out the Reserve, and on each occasion I received many letters in which complaint was made of the loss entailed upon the men. Continental countries are very careful in calling out the Reserve; they only call upon them at times of great emergency. Personally, I do not think our Reserve is very well treated; I do not think, for instance, it is sufficiently paid. The hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) mentioned a good many remedies, but I should not like to see any of them adopted. I would go further. I cannot help thinking that at the present time you act in a perfectly absurd manner. A man who has been three or six years in the Army, who has a good character, who is a good marksman, and who possibly wants to stay on, you force into the Reserve, and then he may not be able to get any work. On the other hand, you have a bad soldier, who does not want to stay in the Army, who is a bad marksman, and you will keep him on. Lord Wolseley once said that one man who shot well was worth half-a-dozen who shot badly, and I think that this can very easily be proved. You actually insist upon one man staying on, while you make another, who is ten times as good as him, join the Reserve. Why do not you allow a man to stay on after his term of service if he wishes to? You give a man three years' or six years' service whether he likes it or whether he does not; but, in my opinion, a much more simple and satisfactory method would be to allow the soldier to remain with his regiment as long as he chooses. You would not diminish your Reserve, because you would have a lot of men going into it after one year's service, but you would make service in the Army much more attractive than it is at present. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War should look over the whole system, and should make up his mind whether it is good or bad. It cannot be said that it has not been well tried. No doubt, it is necessary to have Reserve men; but, to get a good Reserve, you must either increase the pay of the Service or adopt the plan I have suggested. You should not force a man to join the Reserve unless he is a bad character, or a bad soldier, so that then, when the ordinary Reserve man came to you and said his pay was not sufficient, you could reply—"You joined the Reserve voluntarily, or because you were not a good soldier, and you must take the consequences." But I contend that to force a good man to enter the Reserve after six years' service is treating him badly, if you do not find him an ordinary subsistence, which, as the hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) has shown, he does not get at present. Though he may get employment sometimes, the State gives him very little to do; in fact, it does not give as much work as it might give to Reserve men. I think, on the whole, that the Reserve is badly treated, and that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) should take the matter into his careful consideration.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardine): I wish to add a word to those of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who has just sat down (Colonel Nolan). There is, in my opinion, a delusion in respect to the annual increase of Reserve men, which ought to be made known to this Committee. By the existing process of transferring trained soldiers from the ranks of battalions of Infantry, the Reservists may be increased to a large extent, but at the cost of diminishing the battalion effectives. At present, by the latest Monthly Return of the Army, the rank and file of the Infantry of the Line battalions ought to be, according to the established strength, 114,000, whereas the effectives are only 104,000, thus showing a deficiency in battalions of 10,000 rank and file. This is partly traceable to the depôt effectives being in excess of the established strength; the effectives being 12,000 rank and file, whilst the fixed number is 8,000—thus making 4,000 rank and file of the battalions to be at the depôts. Now, on examining the Return of Transfers from the Effective Service to the Reserve List, as also the Return of Recruits who have joined battalions, it is quite clear that if the battalions had retained their trained men, instead of parting with them to swell the Reserve, the effective strength of the battalions would have been nearly maintained at the fixed establishment, instead of being one-tenth below it. Then the depôts have also been a delusion, which deserves serious attention. As already stated, the strength in rank and file fixed for depôts of Line Infantry is 8,000, whilst the actual effectives are 12,000—or 4,000 in excess. But the difference between effective and established strength, only a year or two before, was much greater, the establishment of depôt rank and file being at one time 5,500 whilst the strength in a depôt was 14,000, the excess of 8,500 being taken from the battalion strength; and yet large numbers of transfers to the Reserve List are shown to have then been made, thereby still further lessening the efficiency of the Home and Foreign Battalions. On these grounds, I urge the Secretary of State to fix the strength in depôt at the rate of at least 100 privates for each of the 141 battalions —making in a depôt 14,100 privates. Indeed, it may be advisable to calculate on 150 privates being the average waste of each battalion, thereby needing 21,150 privates to be kept in training in the 69 depôts. This strength will ensure the filling up of all vacancies in battalions, including the transfer of trained soldiers to the Reserve List, but only to such an extent as will not lower the strength of battalions below the established number. There is an existing waste, which I desire to mention to the Committee. It is the many depôts now maintained for 141 battalions. The system of one depôt for the seven battalions of Guards at Caterham, or the one depôt at Walmer for the Marines, may be followed with advantage for the Infantry of the Line. Instead of 69 depôts, 15 or 20 would be far more useful and less costly. The waste in battalions would be more readily met by average losses being spread over 10 or 15 battalions, instead of, as at present, one or two battalions located in unhealthy stations.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I venture to think that the great difficulty with reference to the Reservists is that of employment and the labour market. It is no use disguising the fact that manufacturers will not take men who have been in the Service and who can be called on again. If two artizans present themselves before a manufacturer and ask for service, and one man can earn 2*s*. 6*d*. a-week more than the other, or if there is any doubt which to select, he always takes the civilian and not the old soldier. You cannot object to manufacturers not taking old soldiers, if they think they can get more useful men; but I do think that employment can be given to these old soldiers in the Departments of the Government. The employment of Army clerks and writers has increased by leaps and bounds in the country, and many men in the regiments are kept away from their ordinary duties and employed in clerical work, particularly in answering questions put to the various sections of the Army by the Commanding Officers, the War Office, and other Government Departments. Surely this work might be taken from men who have important military duties to attend to, and might be made to afford employment to some of the Reservists, who would be quite competent to act as clerks and writers in Government Offices. Then there is the question of the re-enlistment of Reservists. A man wrote to *The Times* the other day and stated that he could not re-enlist because he had spent his deferred pay. Of course, he had spent his deferred pay—every soldier does. He was told that unless he could replace his deferred pay he could not re-enlist. Well, he could not replace it, and, consequently, could not re-enlist. Another point, which should be considered, is the fact that the men, when they are discharged from the Service, having no work to go to are compelled, through no fault of their own, to move about as tramps in search of it. They go about the country, from North to South, their condition is observed by all classes, and they make the Army stink in the nostrils of the country. I venture to think that Reserve men should be allowed to re-enlist, and that as much employment as possible should be found for them in connection with Government Offices.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I listened with attention to the remarks which fell from the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) as to a question in which we are all extremely interested, and upon which the hon. and gallant Baronet spoke with great authority. He spoke of the actual number of the Reserves. I am glad to tell him there are more than he thinks—that at present we have 45,000 men. He spoke of the necessity of battalions at home being well maintained, and I concur with him in his view on that point. I believe the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) sought to contribute to the efficiency of battalions by raising the number of men in them to 750 as a rule, and I hope it will be possible to maintain that number by recruiting. I agree with my hon. and gallant Friend that, unless the battalions at home contain an adequate number of trained men, they cannot supply an adequate number of trained men to the linked battalions abroad. I am asked to consider a great many serious questions which have been dealt with by my Predecessors, and settled, after great consideration. I am asked to consider the whole question of Reserves and Deferred Pay. I undertake to consider them; but I cannot undertake to make great changes upon very short notice, nor can I undertake to hold out prospects that these changes will be made unless I am convinced that they are absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the Service. The system of Reserves that now obtains was adopted after very serious and very prolonged consideration. I own that at the time the new system was adopted I considered that its adaptability to the circumstances of our Army was very doubtful. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) spoke of the fact that our Reserve was not like the Reserve of any other country. The circumstances of the Reserve of this country and those of other European countries, are wholly different. We have a Volunteer Army to begin with; we have only a certain limited number to whom we can appeal to serve in the Army. We have, therefore, conditions to contend with, conditions which we deliberately accept, which are altogether different to those which prevail in any Continental or European Armies. Under the circumstances it is inevitable that the conditions under which the Reserve exists should be different in principle from those which prevail in other European Armies. We do not pretend to have a great Army, and all we look for is that, so far as it goes, it shall be an efficient Army, and that we shall have an efficient Reserve on which we can depend in time of emergency. The circumstances in which we find ourselves are difficult; but I freely admit that it is the duty and responsibility of the Military Authorities, and those who represent the War Department, to provide a Force on which the country can rely in a time of difficulty and emergency. I say that if the Commission which at present is in existence seems to think that our Reserve is insufficient, I shall be the first to bring the matter before the House. But I am not prepared to admit that the circumstances at the present moment seem to require an increase. The hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Nolan) stated, I think, that the Reserve pay is only 4*d.* a-day, but, as a matter of fact, it is 6*d.* The hon. and gallant Member asks that the men in the ranks shall be allowed to stay on as long as they choose. Well, there is a great deal to be said in favour of that principle; but I ask what would become of the Reserve if that principle were to be now applied? Where would be the men upon whom we could fall back, and on whom we could rely in time of emergency, if none of the men in the ranks were willing to go into the Reserve? There would be no Reserve. There must be some sort of rule applied to the men whom we ask to enlist. It may be that they should be asked to enlist for a shorter time than they now do. It may be that they should have their pay increased; but there must be some rule by which we could with certainty accumulate a Reserve for times of difficulty and emergency. The hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Sir George Balfour) recommended that we should increase the size of the depôts. I am sure the hon. and gallant Member will excuse me if I say that I am not prepared to follow him immediately into that matter. I will only say that I will examine the question and endeavour to form an opinion upon it. The hon. and gallant Member for Essex (Major Rasch) spoke of the necessity for finding employment for our soldiers. I must say I am under the impression that a good soldier is a person whom many employers would engage in preference to an ordinary civilian. There is a very wide-spread feeling in favour of an old soldier—a man who brings a good certificate with him as a steady and reliable man. I should be loth to believe that because a man was discharged from active service in the Army and was a Reserve man, that, therefore, he would experience greater difficulty in obtaining employment than men who had not had a military training. For my own part, I think that the discipline of the Army, and the training a man gets in the Service, especially fits him for many employments in life in which regularity, discipline, and trustworthiness are required. Indeed, it seems to me that the fact of a man's having been a soldier, is a great deal in his favour.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardine): One of the recommendations of the Committee which was presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers), and of which I myself was a Member, was that soldiers should, where practicable, be employed by the Government in the various Departments, after their discharge. That recommendation does not seem to have been carried out.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I agree with the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Military Authorities should endeavour to employ as many of these soldiers as possible, and I believe that they do so. The hon. and gallant Member for North Lambeth (General Fraser) spoke of the necessity of having an efficient Cavalry; and, in reply to him, I would say that it is impossible that any man should hold a position at the War Office without appreciating to the fullest extent this necessity. My Predecessors adopted an extremely wise course. They sent to Canada to obtain remounts for Cavalry regiments, where they could obtain them more efficiently and satisfactorily than they could be supplied in this country. The supply of horses has given great concern to the Department, and is doing so at the present time; and I shall gladly follow the invitation that has been given by my hon. and gallant Friend, and do everything in my power, consistently, as I said on another Vote, to provide the country with an efficient force of Cavalry. Many valuable suggestions have been made by my hon. and gallant Friends in the course of the debate which has taken place. I could not at this moment be expected to express a distinct policy and conclusion with regard to many of them; but I can assure those hon. and gallant Gentlemen that their suggestions will receive most careful consideration.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): No one, I am sure, could complain of the tone in which we were met by the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith); but I think one of his arguments calls for some answer. The right hon. Gentleman contrasts our Army with Continental Armies, and seems to think that, looking at the conditions under which our Army exists, we have done very well. He did not quite say that; but I think that was the tone of it, speaking, as he was, as Secretary of State for War. Without contradicting the right hon. Gentleman, I would say that we have entirely changed the character of our Army. Formerly it was a professional Army as far as the men were concerned; but, owing to forcing men into the Reserve, it is rapidly ceasing to be professional, and I should think that in 8 or 10 years' time it will have altogether ceased to be so. That is a point that should be remedied by the Secretary of State for War, by allowing good soldiers to stay in the ranks if they desire to. The right hon. Gentleman seems to fear that if the plan I recommend were adopted, it would have the result of making the Reserve too small. I do not think it would have that result—in fact, there would be a large number of men who would be willing to leave at any time, and I would let them go as soon as they were drilled, instead of sending away the good soldiers who wish to stay. That arrangement, it seems to me, would suit everyone. It would suit the soldier, and it would certainly suit the country, which would have to pay less, and would get better material for its money. What I particularly want the public to know, and what I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War should remember, is that the Army has never been thoroughly tried under the short service system. There have only been a few small wars during recent years, and in those wars Lord Wolseley, who backs up the short service system, carefully utilized the old soldiers. You have not had that trial that Lord Napier, in connection with the Peninsula, talked so much about. In the old Peninsula days they took a soldier and put him under an iron system, and, whether he was a good man or a bad one, they made a good soldier of him.

Vote *agreed to*.

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £260,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West): I think that this Vote is one of those questions which deserve the very serious consideratio nof the Committee. I think it is under this Vote that the contracts are made. ["No, no!"] Then I will reserve my observations.

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM (Hants, Fareham): The break-down in our military arrangements has nearly always been in connection with the transport, and that break-down has always been not so much for want of animals, as the want of knowledge how to use the animals in war. In a highly civilized country like England, of course it is impossible to transport our men and material from barrack to barrack by road. We have no need to use the road here; but it pretty generally happens that in war we have not the use of railways and canals, and that the transport has to be carried by road. The Commissariat, I think, thoroughly understand their duties, and perform them very well; but they are scarcely able to provide for what may be called the general transport of the Army. A large part of the *impedimenta* has to be carried by what we may call the regimental transport, and for this purpose there are handed over to the Infantry a number of baggage waggons, horses, and carts. I cannot conceive a worse system than this, for it is bound to result in an enormous loss of animals; not only does it involve great monetary loss, but it is seriously detrimental to the transport of the Army. There is a great deal of knowledge required in the proper management of transport animals, nearly as much as is required in the management of horses; and there is a knowledge of saddling and of transport waggons and carts also required. It is for lack of proper knowledge of these matters and want of skill that the great break-downs have always occurred in our campaigns. When I had command of the Cavalry Brigade at Aldershot, in 1882, squads of 30 men from each of the Infantry regiments, ordered on the Egyptian Campaign, were sent to Cavalry regiments for three days' instruction in the management of horses and mules. It is hardly possible to conceive anything more absurd than that, and the Service suffered for it—the loss was enormous, not only in animals, but in the efficiency of the Service. Well, it is no use making a complaint unless one suggests a remedy. My impression is that it would be a good thing if some 30 men of each Infantry regiment at home could be sent during the winter season, when no drill is being carried on, to the nearest Cavalry barracks, there to be instructed in the management of horses and carts. Then I would suggest that a small nucleus of the regimental transport should be established in every regiment, I would give them four carts and 12 horses, and I believe that with that nucleus you would have the means of working up a pretty good staff for the operations of war. Supposing in the Infantry the transport men remain two years after they were trained you would always have 60 efficient men for these duties. By the system I have mentioned it seems to me you would always find it possible to keep the men moderately efficient in the knowledge of their duties. It may be said that it would lead to great expense to find these horses and carts; but there is always a great deal of expense in the matter of transport in connection with the railways and about the camps which could be relieved by the means I suggest. I think, in fact, that with care it would be possible to make the regimental transport repay its own expenses. There are always many works being carried on in connection with barracks which require transport. Such an auxiliary service as I suggest would be available, for instance, to the Engineers who repair the barracks, and who are constantly requiring transport. I am always unwilling to suggest anything that would necessitate a great expenditure; but if what I propose were adopted it would be possible, with a comparatively small outlay, to establish not a Transport Corps, but a nucleus which might be of very considerable use in time of war, and we might obviate the great break-downs which occur in all our wars, especially at the beginning of them. It may be said that Cavalry regiments would object to having the burden of 30 or 40 Infantry soldiers thrust upon them. I think I can say, on behalf of the commanders of Cavalry regiments, that they would welcome the assistance of these 30 or 40 Infantry soldiers during the winter season. There is one other point of a somewhat similar character I should like to mention. We ought to provide all our regiments with ambulances—that is, a few mules and litters should be given to every regiment. I am aware that the Commissariat and Transport Corps provide ambulances; but I think that every regiment should have a certain amount of ambulance material under its own control. Mules are very vicious animals, and unless the men in charge of them understand them they often kick and give great pain to the sick and wounded. I do not know whether hon. Members have tried to manage mules; but if they have they will know that they are the most intractable brutes one can find. But with men who understand them they are tractable, and the very best transport that can be provided for the sick. I hope the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) will kindly give some thought to my suggestions, which I believe, if adopted, would be of very practical use, both in transport and ambulance matters.

MR. P. McDONALD (Sligo, N.): I hope I shall be excused for obtruding myself in this debate. I am in every sense of the word a non-combatant; but I rise to tell the tale of that very deserving class of men—the barrack clerks. In 1866 a Royal Warrant was issued for the purpose of putting in order the Barrack Department of the Service at the same time that the other three Military Departments were reconstituted. In the reconstitution two offices were opened up; one was that of barrack master, and the other that of barrack clerk. For both offices commissioned officers were eligible, and for the latter non-commissioned officers also. Of commissioned officers who accepted one or other of the offices there were, I believe, 40, and these men accepted the appointments on the understanding and in the hope that their positions would be improved, and that a certain retiring allowance or pension would be granted them on the expiry of their term of service. Before they were entitled to any allowance or pension another Army reform was made—the reform of 1871, under which the Barrack Department, in conjunction with the other three Departments of the Military Service, was again reformed. The consequence was that these offices were abolished, or, at least, they were so remodelled that the same officers could not continue to hold them, or, rather, to hold the new positions. It was all very well for the commissioned officers or the barrack masters; they were permitted to retire on full pay. How was it with the barrack clerks? To them the hope deferred was never realized. They got no retiring allowance whatsoever; and I know that one officer—a very deserving officer who had had 28 years' service in the Northern District—had to retire on a pension of £90 a year, whereas a few years before, under other and different circumstances, he would have been entitled to £200 a-year. Now, the barrack clerks are very hard-working and deserving men, and they ought not to be subjected to hardships such as this. They have complained, and justly so, but what was the reply they received? "You are old soldiers; you must bear with it, for it is your duty." That is no consolation to an old soldier, to a man who has done good service to his country, and who expects his country will care for him in his old days. If such treatment is to be continued—if there is to be no redress given to this deserving class of men, a very bad example will be held out to the young men of the country, and will, no doubt, deter many from entering the Service. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) to take the case of these officers into account, and to show them that consideration which their position and claims entitle them to.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardine) said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would do whatever he could to improve the Commissariat and Transport Services.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I understand the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) prefers to hear all the criticisms before he replies; and, therefore, I venture now to bring under his notice a matter which has appeared to me for some years to be of great consequence in connection with this Vote. But, before I proceed to refer to that matter, I ought to say that I am glad to endorse what has fallen from my hon. Friend the Member for North Sligo (Mr. P. McDonald) with regard to the barrack clerks. If I remember rightly, there are not more than eight or nine of these men; many of them are men of exceedingly long service—over 40 years; men who have given good service, and who now, at the end of their days, find themselves in a most exceptional position with respect to the terms of retirement. Many of their juniors, their subordinates, are enabled to retire on terms quite as good as these unfortunate men have before them. I am sure the sense of justice of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) will enable him to better the condition of the barrack clerks. Sir, the point which I especially rose to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to is an item of £500 at the bottom of page 43, "for taking remain at Woolwich." For some years I have endeavoured to impress on the Government the very great importance of the question of the reserve stores of the Army; and I am gratified to think that, after two or three years' struggle in the Public Accounts Committee, I was enabled to effect some little improvement. But I am not satisfied with what has been done, because I believe the War Office Authorities have not met the representations which have been made to them fairly or generously, and have not come up to the anticipations and intended requirements of the Treasury in the matter. The stores on hand have a nominal value of many millions—about £12,000,000; but this amount represents the value of the stores estimated at the making cost, or the cost of purchase. Now, a Return has been furnished for two or three years in succession, showing the value of the stores on hand in the War Office; but this Return is perfectly valueless. At the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee it was elicited that the sum of £100,000 realized by the sale of old stores really represented a nominal value of 12 times that amount; so that where you have £1,200,000 worth of stores shown as being on hand, in reality, when you come to realize the stores, you have not £1,200,000 worth, but only £100,000 worth. Well, Sir, as far back as 1884, the Treasury said, and the Public Accounts Committee endorsed what the Treasury said—

> "The audit of the store account is important, and the difficulties connected with it must be fairly faced. The step which is now being taken"—

that is, the step which was promised by the War Office Authorities—

> "is, in their opinion, an all-important step towards the realization of that object. First of all, the War Office should compile an annual account of stocks of Army stores, and when such an account as that is prepared it will be for the Treasury to judge to what extent that provides an efficient control over the Army stores."

The Public Accounts Committee reported that they were strongly impressed with the advantage of an audit independent and outside of the Department. However careful and exact the Departmental audit might be, they believed that an arrangement might be made for an impartial audit by placing a fixed sum annually at the disposal of the Comptroller and Auditor General. Now, this sum of £500 in the present Estimate is not placed at the disposal of the Comptroller and Auditor General, but is handed over to the War Office to be spent in what they are pleased to call "taking remain at Woolwich." It is quite clear, from the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee, that the following year the Treasury expected the War Office Authorities to furnish an account which would show the stock in hand; not the value, but the quantity. It was under that impression that the Treasury was left by the War Office Authorities. A representative of the Treasury then said—

> "So far as the account presented by the War Office goes, I should not be prepared to accept this abstract as satisfying completely what the Treasury have asked for."

Again, last year the Public Accounts Committee urged upon the Treasury and upon the War Office the propriety of having a Return showing the actual quantity of stores on hand, and again the War Office demurred to furnishing the account, and the Treasury failed to insist upon their doing so. The representative of the War Office was asked why his Department had not obeyed or acted upon the representation of the Committee; and his answer—a perfectly proper Departmental answer—was that the War Office did not act upon the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee, but upon the direction which they received from the Treasury, founded upon the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee. In view of that the Committee reported that the estimate of the value of the stores in the reserve depôts which had been given in the Appropriation Account was not in itself sufficient. Though the Committee considered the Estimate formed the foundation of a store audit, they suggested that the quantities of the principal articles in stock should be specified. The Committee were glad to observe that so far steps had been taken in the direction they desired; but they hoped that some more rapid progress might be made with this important question. That it is a very important question will, I think, appear to the Committee if they will allow me to read to them certain figures from the last statement with regard to stores. The statement furnished is a statement which shows only the official value of the stores in hand, and yet this alone reveals a very serious state of things. In March, 1884, the value of the accoutrements, small arms, and small arm material in hand was £2,088,000; but that had been so reduced that on the 31st of March, 1885, it was only £1,530,000. That is to say, that upon that one class of stores alone there had been a falling-off in value to the extent of £500,000. With regard to ordnance, there is a falling-off in the value of field guns, smooth-bore guns, gun carriages, and the like, of £60,000. In transport material there was a considerable reduction, and in projectiles, including gunpowder and gun ammunition, there was a diminution in value to the extent of nearly £200,000. Small arm ammunition diminished in value, and presumably also in quantity, and the other ordnance stores sank from a value of £1,838,000 to £1,575,000, or nearly £250,000. So that, besides a reduction of £500,000 in the value of accoutrements and small arm materials, there was a reduction of £250,000 in the value of the ordnance stores. Sir, the same story is traceable all through the barrack, hospital, and military prison stores. There is a reduction from £378,000 to £309,000—£69,000. The Committee will therefore see that upon this total of £12,500,000 there is in one year a reduction in stores of £1,100,000 worth. But that is not the worst of it. This is a reduction according to what is called *The Woolwich Vocabulary Price List*. Now, *The Woolwich Vocabulary Price List* is a large volume containing an enormous number of items, with the officially recognized prices set against them; and the War Office having in hand a large number of guns, many of them altogether obsolete, which cost a considerable amount in the manufacture, still include in their Valuation Return these guns as stores in hand. That was illustrated very well last year, when, as I said, an enormous amount of stores were sold for, I think, £93,000, which in reality would have represented on this list twelve times that amount. The whole of this Return is perfectly valueless, perfectly misleading, and the object of the Public Accounts Committee has been defeated year after year by the obstinacy of the War Office officials, who, because they have not got explicit directions from the Treasury to furnish an account of the quantity of stores, have every year refused to do so, and they palm off this Report, which is not only worthless, but absolutely misleading. One would suppose the country was prepared for an emergency; but that is far from being the case. With regard to one article alone, there was a depletion of stores to the extent of £100,000 in a single year. There is nothing to show that when stores are depleted proper steps are taken to replenish them. Mr. Disraeli said that depleted stores may be quite as serious a matter as attenuated battalions or phantom ships. The expenditure of £500 for a nominal remain at Woolwich which only results in a Return which is entirely misleading is a simple waste of money. It is not necessary for me to say how I come by my knowledge; but I do know, as a matter of fact, that many of the men engaged on the remain at Woolwich last year looked upon the whole thing as a perfect farce, and knew it was a farce. Nothing will be satisfactory until you treat the War Department as the War Department itself treats every Quartermaster in the Army. Every Quartermaster has to render an account showing what were his stores on a certain date; he has then to give an account of the further stores he receives, and from the total he deducts the stores he issues, and then the balance is that which he is liable to account for when the Inspector comes down. But you cannot do that with the War Office and the Woolwich authorities, because there is absolutely no basis on which to work. There is no balance sheet presented, and I doubt very much whether the War Office could furnish a Return showing the number of any particular articles they have in hand. I know they have a great number of figures written in books in ink, and that they want these figures to be taken as trustworthy; but in reality they are not trustworthy, because they represent, not their efficient stores, but stores which are obsolete, and which would not be issued to regiments on active service. I hope the question I have raised will receive from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) that attention which its importance justifies.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I desire to say a few words in support of the remarks of my hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), for I think no person can have read the last Report of the Public Accounts Committee without feeling that, with reference to this subject, it contains several points which are well deserving careful examination at the hands of the Committee. But before I enter into this matter I wish to refer to another, which I cannot help thinking is of some importance. I find, from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, that about £70,000 is paid every year at Woolwich without the payments being vouched for by regular receipts. It must be quite evident that a system of this kind is very unsatisfactory, and may possibly lead to great swindling. The 14th section of the Revenue Act of 1884 prescribes the duty of the Treasury in such cases as this, and imposes on it the duty of making certain regulations. I should like to know what regulations have been made, or whether any have been made, and, if not, why it is that the War Department itself should not call the attention of the Treasury to the matter, with the view of having the regulations made as quickly as possible? Now, with reference to the subject mentioned by my hon. Friend (Mr. A. O'Connor). The recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee was that the quantities of the principal articles, such as ordnance, rifles, and the like, should be specified; and the hon. and learned Gentleman who is now Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) has remarked that the recommendation was made in order that the War Office should consider whether, in the interest of the country, they would not give the quantities of stores in stock. The answer to that was that the War Office absolutely declined to give the information. The hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that the great object which the Public Accounts Committee had in view was that no Government should tamper with the stores at the expense of the country, and that the stores should be kept up at the same uniform rate. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) has declared still more explicitly the object of the Committee. He said—

> "We want to know how many stand of arms we have got in the armoury. If there is no Government Return available to the Members of this House, showing the actual number of arms in the possession of the Government, it seems to be a most extraordinary position, and one that may lead at no distant date to extraordinary disasters."

I do not think that Her Majesty's Government could turn their attention to any more necessary subject than a rigid examination of the way in which the money is spent in the various Departments of the country. The same excuses are given year after year by the officials of the War Office for not giving the information demanded; and if at any time accounts have been furnished, they have been quite useless for the purpose for which they were wanted—being merely a list of prices such as a tradesman publishes in his hand-bills, and in no sense an account of stock-taking, which is really what is required. It seems to me that this system is absolutely vicious, and that, in the interests of the Public Service, it ought to be searchingly inquired into and ended. It is an extraordinary thing that £95,000 should be put down as the proceeds of articles sold, which are represented in another place as valued at ten times that amount. As far as I can see, these accounts are made up to delude the public. The taxpayers find the money, and there is no guarantee under the present system that their money is properly applied, or that it does not find its way into private pockets instead of being expended for the Public Service. While the system exists I, for one, shall lose no opportunity of protesting as strongly as I can against it as ridiculous, disgraceful, and dangerous.

Mr. JORDAN (Clare, W.): Although I cannot agree with all that has been said by my hon. Friend, I sincerely trust that the present Government will not in this matter follow in the steps of their Predecessors.

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): I have a few words to say on the points raised by hon. Gentlemen on this Vote. In the first place, the observations of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Hampshire (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram) with regard to regimental transport are entitled to great weight with the War Office, and I will certainly take care that the subject which he has brought forward shall be fully considered. With regard to the observations of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. P. McDonald) on the subject of barrack masters, they disclose a state of circumstances of which I was not aware. I will, however, inquire into them, and I am certain that if any just cause of complaint exists it will receive proper consideration at the hands of the authorities. Then, Sir, with regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) and the hon. Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) as to the question of stores, I have no disposition at all to minimize the subject which they have brought forward, and which the hon. Member for Donegal supported by a reference to various statements which are perfectly accurate. I should regret that the Department should do anything in the way of allowing the stores to be unduly depleted; and, whether my term of Office be short or long, I shall do all in my power to prevent it. It is a serious matter, and Governments have certainly in the past occasionally allowed these stores to become dangerously low. It is quite possible that some such reform as that advocated by hon. Gentlemen opposite should be adopted; but, of course, I cannot be expected to make any complete statement on that subject.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): I have some points to urge in connection with this Department which have been before the public for some time, but have not been brought forward in the present discussion. In the first place, I would ask what is the condition of the Army to be when it is called, as it is quite probable it may be called in a short time, on active service—what will be its position if there is no proper Commissariat; and how will the Commissariat work when you have two opposition Departments supplying it, a system which must militate against its success? I find, Sir, that the Commissary General is not responsible for the quality of the stores supplied to the Army in the shape of food, forage, and horses. That is a most important point, and it is one that is urged in Military Reports dealing with the subject; and I should have thought that some hon. Members who are acquainted with all the details which have come before them would have brought the matter under the notice of Her Majesty's Government. We are told that the Commissary General is little more than an Adjutant —that is to say, that this officer, who ought to know everything about the stores supplied to the Army, is an officer who deals with the men under his command more than with the stores of his Department. He is principally, it appears, concerned with the men under his charge; whereas I find that all these other matters are referred to the Surveyor General of Ordnance. Well, I ask, is the Surveyor General of Ordnance a practical man, who, by experience and training, is competent to deal with these important matters? No, Sir; we find that this is not the case. He is a War Office official, a Conservative, and a civilian; and of course, as a civilian, he is not capable of dealing with these most important military items. Going into the past history of this Department, what do we find? We find that, whenever the British Army has entered into any serious war with a Foreign Power, the first Department to break down has been the Commissariat. We shall also see, by going into military history, that the Ordnance Department was shelved a few years after it was appointed, and the control went to another Department, which in its turn broke down, and so we have now a double duty devolving alternately upon two branches of the Service. Then, Sir, it seems to me an anomaly that the Surveyor General of Ordnance, who is a civilian, should draw a much larger salary—namely, £1,500 a-year—than an official who ought, at least, to have practical knowledge and experience in dealing with these matters, and who only draws £1,095 a year. I find that the Director of Supplies has a salary of £1,000 a-year, and that assistants and Directors of Contracts also draw large sums. Now, Sir, it is alleged by competent authorities that instead of having all these clerks the whole of the work ought to be done by the Commissary General and his staff, and that if that were carried into effect the country would not only be saved great expense, but the work would be better done. It is, therefore, my intention to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £4,500, which represents the salaries of these officials. You will find, Sir, that the Adjutant General has expressed himself in favour of this course being adopted; and if he is not strongly in favour of it, he ought to be so, in consequence of the Reports which have reached us. Now, with regard to the officering of the Commissariat Department, it is plainly observable that very few officers enter the Department; and not only that, but we find that those who do enter leave it after five years' service. There is very small inducement to remain so far as the pay is concerned. We find that these men become dissatisfied with their position and give it up. Why is that? In the first place, an officer coming into the Commissariat loses his mess; he finds that there is a mess, but that he is not entitled to be a member of it. It will be said that when an officer goes to his station he is made an honorary member of the mess. That is true; but he is not entitled to be a member; he is only allowed to become a member by complaisance, which is certainly an indignity to him, and reflects on the Service which he has joined; and we find it constantly urged that when he leaves the society of the regiment, where he is known and knows everybody, he becomes only "one of those clerks," as they are called, who are certain to be looked down upon. Thus he not only loses the society of his friends, but his *prestige* also. He also loses in the matter of hospitality, because, if a man goes to a station as a Commissariat officer, he is not likely to receive the same amount of hospitality as would be shown to an officer belonging to a regiment. Officers belonging to a regiment, as is well known, have the greatest hospitality shown to them, and it is customary for them to return it; but the unfortunate Commissariat officer has no opportunity of returning it, because he is only an honorary member of the mess. I am also told that the Army Pay Department offers more inducements, and, accordingly, you will find that gentlemen belonging to Her Majesty's Service desire to enter it; perhaps, for pecuniary reasons, they go to the Army Pay Department rather than to the Ordnance Department. For these reasons, I think that the whole constitution of the Commissariat Staff requires investigation and re-organization not only for the sake of the Service, but in the interest of the taxpayers. With regard to the Transport Department, we find that a large number of tradesmen belong to it. We find that they are supposed to enter the Service with the view of making the trades they have learnt of advantage to the corps to which they belong; but, instead of that being the case, the result is quite the reverse, because, instead of being employed in their various trades, they are employed as transport drivers. Consequently, there are many complaints on the part of the tradesmen who have learnt their business, and entered the Service in order to practise their trades, that their knowledge is allowed to lapse. For these reasons, I maintain that the two Services ought not to be interchangeable; that the men who enter in one particular branch should work in that branch alone, and that so long as the present state of affairs exists so long will these Departments be a disgrace to the country—it will be in the future as it has been in the past.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £255,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."—(*Dr. Tanner.*)

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W.): I can assure the House that in the Nile Expedition, at any rate, the Commissariat, far from being inefficient, was, equally with the Medical Department, in a very efficient state. The Force was very well supplied under exceptionally difficult circumstances.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): There is one point to which my hon. Friend (Dr. Tanner) has not referred, and which I do not think has come within his knowledge. It came to my knowledge when presiding over a Committee which was appointed to inquire into the state of the Commissariat in Egypt, when the War Office came to the conclusion that the Committee occupied so much attention that they could not carry on the war and the Committee at the same time. I was very much struck by the fact that there was no head to the Commissariat and Transport. Although there is a Director of Contracts, you have no Director of Commissariat and Transport—you have no head to look to. I think that the whole War Office recognizes that the Commissariat is faulty. The Secretary of State has no subordinate in this matter; the Director of Contracts shuffles off responsibility on to someone else, and those upon whose shoulders he lays it transfer the burden to someone else. There should be proper officials to take responsibility, and you could then, if necessary, find fault with them in the House. I think the right hon. Gentleman should either start the Committee —though, perhaps, it is too old a story to re-open—or he should ask some Department to inquire into the system. I think there is a great deal in what was urged by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), because if you do not give these persons a good position you injure their *status*. I defy the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State to say who is responsible for transport. Though he has excellent assistants sitting beside him, he has no one to advise him on Admiralty matters. It was pointed out in the last Committee that during the Egyptian Campaign the senior Commissariat officer was in London he wanted to interfere, but that the other officials would not let him, saying—"Your work begins in Egypt." There seems to be no proper responsibility in this matter; and I think it is quite time that the matter was looked into. If there was a great war looming ahead, as the hon. and gallant Member for Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) said, the Government would have to look into these matters; but I would advise them to do so at once, so as to be prepared for any emergency. As the Commissariat Committee was stopped, and as a previous House of Commons sanctioned the action of the Government in the matter, it appears to me high time that they looked thoroughly into it themselves, and endeavoured to get a responsible technical adviser on transport affairs. I feel it to be absolutely necessary that they should move in the matter.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): There is just one matter on this question of Commissariat that I wish to submit to the right hon. Gentleman. At present considerable sums are disbursed regimentally by certificate and regimental order, which, if they were charged by external authority, would be reduced—such as forage allowances that do not exist, lodging allowances for officers who are in barracks, and charges for fuel and lighting that are not used strictly according to the Regulations. Those officers who are concerned in the matter now are under the influence of regimental officers, lieutenant colonels and others. There is no denying the fact that the War Office Staff are perfectly well aware that many certificates that are signed by officers as to allowances are not absolutely correct. Money is issued on certificates of officers which would not be issued if some independent authority were required to look into the charges and sign the certificates. I would draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to two vouchers of accounts that I now hold in my hand. One is for forage, hay and straw, drawn at ——. I will not mention the place. This is a voucher on which was to be drawn a certain amount of allowance for a considerable number of men. It is signed by the Lieutenant Colonel commanding, but it is signed in blank. Here is another: A Return of officers and non-commissioned officers of the —— Regiment of Foot, occupying —— Barracks, Depôt ——, and somewhat similar in effect. This also is signed in blank by an officer, who wanted to go away and signed a large number of vouchers by anticipation, this amongst the rest. In this regiment, at any rate, there is ample ground for saying that one officer drew forage for a horse that did not exist. He had not one—["Name!"]—no; I shall not give the name—but when it was necessary for him to produce a horse he hired one. In the same battalion there was an officer who was drawing lodging allowance, and at the same time was accommodated in barracks; and as to fuel and lighting allowance, if the right hon. Gentleman will question some people in Pall Mall, he will come to the conclusion that some of these charges would not be allowed if the Commissariat officers had to deal with these persons instead of the Quartermasters, who are subject to regimental officers.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): With regard to what has fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), I must say I think he made his statement to some extent on imperfect information. He says the Surveyor General of the Ordnance is responsible for the contract supplies he has mentioned, and not the General Officer. As a general rule the duty of supplying these things is vested in the General Officer, who has attached to him a Commissariat officer to see that the duty is properly carried out. The local contracts for supplies—and the majority of contracts are local — are made by the General Commanding. There are certain cases in which the General Commanding may have to refer to the Commander-in-Chief on questions relating to the state of the Commissariat Department, to its numbers and efficiency. If there are points in dispute, the contracts do come before the Surveyor General, who takes advice from the permanent officials at headquarters. I believe that in these cases the Commissariat officers themselves are invariably consulted, and that, generally speaking, the great bulk of the contract questions are disposed of by them. I believe it has been considered that it would be a mistake to take from the General Officer commanding the responsibility of the supplies to the troops under his command, and all the Commissariat has to do is to see that the duty is properly performed. When a foreign campaign is going on, and when it might be difficult to obtain supplies, then the duty of supplying the troops with food and stores is taken away from the contractors on the spot and vested in the War Office. If I understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the Adjutant General disapproved of the present system I am informed that he is much mistaken. I am told that he expressed the strongest approval of it. As to the pay and position of the Commissariat officers, I believe there is no doubt that it is not at present good; but inquiries are being made which it is hoped will have the effect of improving their position. With regard to what the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) said, I certainly should not presume to think that I could express any opinion which would be of the slightest value; but I am far from saying that it is not possible that some improvement might be made in the matter he referred to. Much improvement might be made which would prevent the possibility of the recurrence of such scandals as the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) referred to; but I am afraid I cannot answer the questions which have been put in greater detail.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the hon. Gentleman consider the suggestion I made to him as to the officers?

Mr. NORTHCOTE: Yes.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Though the answers of the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of Ordnance cannot be deemed entirely satisfactory, still, from the general tone of the hon. Gentleman's reply, I think it would be, perhaps, better not to press the Amendment to a division, as I had intended at the outset. But, at the same time, I must say the House does not care to take it for granted that complaints which are made are groundless, simply because it is said by a Member of the Government that, "as a general rule, things are not done in such and such a way," and that "they believe the Commissariat officers were consulted." Answers like that I cannot deem altogether satisfactory; but, taking the affair as a whole, and from the general tone of the hon. Gentleman's reply, I do not intend to take a division.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £426,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

Mr. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I beg to move that this Vote be reduced by £30,000. I am afraid I shall have to trespass a little on the time of the Committee to explain the reasons why I ask for this very large reduction in the Vote. I wish to explain that I desire this amount to be deducted from the sum that is set aside for the purpose of keeping the factory at Pimlico going; and I wish it to be understood at the outset that I am moving in this matter entirely on public grounds. I think it is very bad policy on the part of the Government to confine themselves entirely for their supplies to their own particular factory. I believe it to be desirable that other factories should be called into existence and nursed and kept alive in times of peace, so that they may be useful in times of war. We hold the opinion that the factory at Pimlico, being at present worked up to its highest point of tension, will be utterly useless in time of war to supply the increased requirements of an Army put into the field. Let the Committee understand that this Vote is divided into three parts, and that the largest portion is applied to the Pimlico Factory—namely, £60,000. That amount is devoted to regimental work at Pimlico, and £20,000 is devoted to outside contracts. In time of war the regiments would not be able to get on with merely their £60,000 worth of work, and the Pimlico Factory would be utterly unable to take up the work which would have to be done, for the reason, as I say, of being worked up to its fullest possible working ability. Probably that £60,000 worth, together with the rest of the work, would have to be put out to public competition, and then the Government would find themselves in this difficulty—that they would have no private factories in the country, no firms with machinery and perfect appliances for taking up their contracts and carrying them out in a satisfactory manner. I also move this reduction on the ground of public economy. It has been proved beyond yea or nay that private firms have been able to turn out the work at considerably less than it costs the country to have it performed at Pimlico. There is one establishment in particular to which I wish to refer, and that is the factory at Limerick, reference to which has often been made in former Parliaments. It has been proved that they make at Limerick many garments which cannot be produced at Pimlico. Now, as I have mentioned the matter of the Limerick Factory, I desire—as it is in their interest, or to some extent in their interest, that I open up this question—to give the Committee every information concerning this factory and its connection with war contracts and with the War Office. It will be necessary for the Committee to understand what the Limerick Army Clothing Factory is. The Army Clothing Factory of Limerick was established about 30 years ago, and the premises, plant, and machinery is sufficient for the employment of 1,500 people, and that number has been sometimes employed, especially during the Civil War in America and the Franco-German War. For many years 1,000 hands were employed in making clothing for our own Army; but for the past 10 years in particular the War Department has monopolized so much of the work for their own factory that the result has been to the Limerick Factory that scarcely work enough can now be obtained to partially employ 500 people. It has been shown from time to time by Parliamentary Returns that the work done in the Limerick Factory is equal in quality and much cheaper than that made in the Government Factory; and the consequent claim of the Limerick *employés* to a larger share of the work has been frequently urged by direct applications, Motions in Parliament, and by deputations waiting upon the Secretary of State for War. This factory was visited some time ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers), when Minister of War. That right hon. Gentleman undoubtedly had in view the nursing of this establishment and the keeping of it up in perfect order, so that he and the Government Department might rely on it in time of difficulty, when a heavy strain occurred and the resources of the Pimlico Factory were stretched beyond their capacity. Well, the right hon. Gentleman, after his visit to Limerick, made an order that two-sevenths of the clothing for the Army should be made by contract; but even this slight concession was never carried out by the War Department, the Director of Clothing, who practically controls the whole business, virtually disregarding any orders in the matter. Though it was arranged to put out two-sevenths of the clothing to be made by contract, the Estimates were prepared as before—that is to say, the £60,000 was given to the Government Factory, and the £20,000 to private contractors. But even then, instead of putting out work to the extent of the £20,000 at the commencement of the year, only about half the quantity is then contracted for, the remainder being put back to the end of the year, when there is not sufficient time to make it up, evidently with the view of making sure that the Government Factory shall not run short of work, the result being that the Vote for the Government Factory is exceeded and the

Contract Vote reduced; and a note of explanation is inserted in the Army Appropriation Accounts, that the reason the Contract Vote was not all expended was because the supplies were not delivered in time. Well, it so happens that at that time a Question on the subject was put in Parliament by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). He asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance on the 7th of August, 1885—

> "Whether the work executed at the Limerick Factory costs less than similar work done at the Government Factory in Pimlico?"

He got a reply from the Surveyor General of Ordnance—then Mr. Guy Dawnay—that the work executed at the Limerick Factory

> "usually, but not invariably, costs less than work executed at Pimlico."

To a further cross question put by the then Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), who asked—

> "Are we to understand that, if the work can be done cheaper than at Pimlico, Limerick will not suffer?"

The Surveyor General of Ordnance replied—

> "Yes; Limerick will not suffer at all."—(3 *Hansard*, [300] 1458.)

Now, let us see whether Limerick has, or has not, "suffered at all." I maintain that it has suffered both by short contracts and by the vexatious conditions attached to those contracts. In order to prove my contention I will ask the attention of the Committee while I read some letters addressed by the Director of Army Contracts by persons connected with the Limerick Army Clothing Factory. On December 3, 1885, they say—

> "SIR,—With reference to the accompanying tender for the annual supply of clothing for next year, we beg to point out that the whole amount represented by wages only amounts to £15,000, and if the Company obtained the whole of the contract it would not suffice to keep the Limerick Factory fully employed for the whole year.
>
> "We beg to remind you of the promise made by the Surveyor General in the House of Commons, that if the work was done cheaper at Limerick than at the Government Factory Limerick should not suffer. As the prices now tendered are lower than those paid at Pimlico for the same garments, we think we have grounds for claiming the fulfilment of that promise.
>
> "With reference to the percentage paid to us hitherto on our accounts, we think it would be fairer when the contract is decided to ascertain the actual difference between the cost of the material issued to the Company and the prices tendered for the made-up garments, and let the difference be the actual percentage to be paid to us.
>
> "We also beg to call attention to the great inconvenience resulting from the delay in inspecting the supply which, during the present year, has been above one month. Without making it a matter of stipulation, we think there should be an understanding that the supplies should be reported upon within one week of the receipt of the goods of Pimlico. As a matter of fact all garments made in the Government Factory must be examined as they are made, and we cannot, therefore, see any objection to such an obvious act of justice to outside contractors.
>
> "We have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servants,
>
> "The Auxiliary Forces Uniform and Equipment Co., Limited.
>
> "W. E. HEATH, Managing Director.
>
> "To the Director of Army Contracts,
> War Office, Pall Mall, S. W."

I stated a short time ago that we claim more work for the Limerick Factory on the ground of economy. Now, I have statistics here to prove that greater economy would be effected by giving a larger amount of work out in contracts than by keeping it in the Pimlico Factory. I will state what the difference is. I will mention the garments, and the percentage I state will be the excess in the cost of making them up at Pimlico over the Limerick price for the same.

	Frocks.	
Tweed	(Royal Artillery)	40 per cent
Cloth	(Royal Engineers)	40 ,,
Kersey	(Infantry)	15 ,,
	Trousers.	
Tweed	(Royal Engineers)	20 ,,
Tartan	(Royal Artillery)	20 ,,
Tweed	(Infantry)	5 ,,

The Cavalry cloaks and capes, great coats and capes, blue cloth (Royal Artillery), &c. are not made at Pimlico; but, as they are obtained in competition, they should also be included in the three years' contract. That proves my statement, that there would be a great saving effected by giving out a larger number of garments to be made by contract. I stated also that there were vexatious conditions attached to the giving out of these contracts; and in order to prove that I must inform the Committee that on the 24th of December, 1885, the following requisition was sent to the Director of Clothing:—

"We beg to hand you herewith requisition for materials for our contract, 18, 12, 85 $\frac{7152}{5561}$ and will feel obliged if you will make the issues weekly, as follows—namely:—

500 Artillery Frocks
1,500 Kersey ,, Infantry
250 Tunics, Infantry
500 Cloaks, Cavalry
500 Capes ,,
1,500 pairs Trousers ,,

To this requisition the following reply was received :—

"Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 24th ultimo, accompanying a requisition for the materials for contract $\frac{7152}{5561}$ 18, 12, 85, I have to inform you that, in accordance with the conditions of the contract, the garments are to be delivered in equal monthly instalments from January to December; and as there are 112,000 garments (exclusive of 20,000 for which materials have already been issued) to be delivered between these periods, the monthly proportion of issues will be 9,400, the last issue to be made about the middle of November, in order that you may be in a position to complete the contract by the 31st December.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"C. H. MORESHEAD,
"Assistant Director of Clothing."

Such an interpretation was never known to be put on a delivery clause before, and it was evident that the clause had been so framed by the Director of Clothing himself for the very purpose of limiting the production of the Limerick Factory, if not of destroying it altogether. What was the effect of that condition? Why, that you have the Limerick Factory working all the year round on half time. They would have the Limerick Factory perform in 12 months an amount of work which could be easily got through in six months. We all know that the principal argument adduced by the Director of the Clothing Factory in Pimlico is that it would greatly increase the proportion of the permanent charge on the cost of production to reduce the factory at Pimlico; but the same thing applies to the Limerick Factory. Mr. R. T. Tait, in a letter to the Director of Army Contracts, says—

"The quantity of material (4,750 garments weekly) asked for, is barely sufficient to keep the Limerick hands employed on three-quarter time. I beg to remark that, during 30 years' experience I have had of Government contracts, I never knew a case in which objection was taken to the delivery of supplies before the periods named in the contract, which have always been regarded as the maximum periods allowed. I hope, therefore, that the Secretary of State for War will be pleased to order the requisition to be complied with by the Director of Clothing."

The result is that the Limerick Factory has been placed on what I would call starvation diet. Not only was the promise of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers) that two-sevenths of the entire sum should be put out to contract not carried out, but even the small amount of work that is put out—£20,000 worth—is spread over 12 months. That, as I say, would only give the Limerick Factory about six months' work. With these vexatious, hampering, and stifling conditions it is required that the Limerick Factory should eke out a miserable existance; and possibly it is hoped that, with other private manufacturing concerns, it will eventually die out altogether. I maintain that it is bad policy to starve out an institution like this. It should be nursed and kept alive, so that it might be possible for the Government to fall back on it and on similar institutions in time of necessity. There is another grievance as to the outside contract work. A great portion of this £20,000 is held back towards the end of the year, so as to hold it over to such a time as that it would be impossible for the Limerick Factory, or any other contractors who might take the work up, to perform it within the required period; and then the Director of the Contracts cunningly applied that part of the £20,000 which remained unexpended, owing to the inability of the contractors to comply with his conditions, to keeping his hands going at Pimlico. So that really there is more than £60,000 voted by this House to keep Pimlico going, and absolutely less than the £20,000 voted for outside contracts eventually reaches the outside establishments. I have another letter here which I must read, in order that the Committee may thoroughly understand this matter. What was the consequence of this starvation? On the 15th of February the manager of the Limerick Factory wrote to the Director of Contracts—

"Sir—On my return here to-day I find the greatest dissatisfaction possible prevails among the people of the factory in consequence of their having been turned out for nearly a fortnight—the end of last month and the beginning of this—for want of materials to proceed with our contract for clothing.

"On account of the change of Government and consequent rising of Parliament, I have not been able to call attention to this subject in the proper quarter; and as it will be a short time before I can do so, I would feel obliged if you would order that the issue of material for next month should be made immediately, in order to avoid a repetition of the hardship and suffering to which the people are exposed, as stated above.

"As this matter is very pressing, kindly wire if you can comply with my request.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
R. T. Tait, Manager,

To this the Director of Contracts sent the following reply:—

"Gentlemen—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant with regard to your contract $\frac{7152}{5561}$ of the 18th December last. In reply, I am to refer you to my letter of the 19th ultimo, in which it was stated, in answer to your request of the 11th idem for the issue of further material, that the terms of the contract must be carried out. Your present application has been submitted to the Surveyor General of Ordnance, who regrets that, on the information before him, he is unable to accede to your request.

"I am, gentlemen,
"Your obedient servant,
"Evan Colville Nepean,
"Director of Army Contracts."

Such is the manner in which the Contracts Department has treated the Limerick establishment. Now, what is it that this Company asks for, and what claim is it that we find ourselves willing and able to sustain? The claim that the factory makes is contained in a letter dated January 2, 1886, and written by Mr. Tait, whose name I have already mentioned. He says—

"With reference to the several interviews I had with you whilst the Annual Clothing Contract was under consideration, I pointed out that the Limerick Factory nearly always got certain descriptions of garments in competition with the rest of the trade, and was very much lower in price than the Pimlico Factory.

"I suggested that if this Company succeeded in the present competition (which it has done), in order to avoid the great hardship upon the operatives here of being thrown out of employment at frequent intervals, that a triennial contract should be entered into for the whole of these garments required for the Service. This would give nearly sufficient work to keep all the workpeople fairly, but not fully, employed all the year round; and I may here remark that when the work is slack it cannot be confined to fewer hands, as all the workpeople insist that whatever work there is should be divided amongst them all, as they have no other means of employment here. Mr. Childers, when he visited Limerick, recognized this fact, and ordered the contracts to be made for three years."

That is our demand—that the contracts should be made for three years, and that the factories should be kept going; that a sufficient amount, or nearly a sufficient amount, of work should be given out to keep the factory going all the year round. We ask, as I said before, that this shall be done on public grounds. The objection of the Director of Clothing to make issues in accordance with the requisition of the 24th of December can only be attributed to a certain amount of unfriendliness or hostility to the Limerick Factory. Whatever his reasons are, he has frustrated from time to time the good intentions of successive Secretaries of State for War with regard to Irish industries; and, taking into account that Ireland contributes pretty largely to the Imperial Revenue, I think that she is entitled to a fair share of the expenditure of those Revenues. Now, the whole Clothing Vote for last year exceeded £1,250,000, and with the exception of perhaps £2,000 or £3,000 paid for linen in the North of Ireland, and the £15,000 spent in Limerick, it is all expended in Great Britain. Not another 1*d.* is spent in Ireland. I think we are entitled to a fair share of this public expenditure, and on that ground we ask that out of the public grant a larger amount should be set aside for public contract work. I think I make this demand at a particularly favourable time—at a time when a Government has come into Office avowedly favourable to Ireland in these respects—a Government that announces at the outset of its career that it is going to issue a Royal Commission for the purpose of making inquiry and seeking out means whereby it can devote money to the advancement of the material resources of Ireland. Well, now, here is a case for the exercise of their philanthropy. If they are in earnest, they have it in their own hands to do a valuable work—not to prop up an industry not indigenous to the soil, but actually to support one that is already in existence. They can do this not only on grounds of philanthropy, but on public grounds — for the sake of economy and the good service of the State. We hold that it is to the interest of the State that this factory should be maintained in all vigour and in all health; but how can it be in vigour or in health if it is on starvation diet for the whole year round? How is it possible that this Company can exist without work? Where is it to look for work? There are no wars, or rumours of wars, on this Continent or on the Continent of America. This Company got work from America during the American War. It occasionally gets a little increase of work when new orders are sent out in consequence of rumours of wars in this country. I believe that 132,000 garments were this year ordered in consequence of such rumour; and, according to an answer given to-night by the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Northcote), 25,300 of these were given to the Limerick Factory. But what does that amount to? Not to more than an additional six weeks' work. I have already pointed out that the amount of work given to it up to the present will only maintain the factory in full employment for six months in the year, and the fact that an additional six weeks' work is to be given does not materially affect my argument. I have moved that the Vote be reduced by £30,000. It is my desire that that sum should be taken from the amount given to the Pimlico Factory. I do not suppose it will be possible, although we are in a time of peace, to have the £60,000 given to Pimlico for regimental work reduced by a single farthing; but if my Motion is carried, it will be possible to get money for the needs of the Pimlico Factory elsewhere. England is a large place—London is a large place, and there are means here for giving employment for factory hands. In Ireland that is not the case. Ireland is a poor country, and has little means of giving employment to her people. It has no means of keeping people in its factories — people who labour at a cheaper rate than do the factory hands of England—unless the factories receive their fair share of work. And it must be remembered that the factory on behalf of which I am pleading not only turns out cheaper work than the Pimlico establishment, but that its work is better done. It is better work than any work of a similar kind in Great Britain. I appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of Ordnance on all these grounds—on the ground of economy, on the ground of fairness, on the ground of philanthropy, and on the ground that it will be beneficial to the State to keep the Limerick Factory alive. I appeal to him and to the Government at large for their most favourable consideration to the circumstances I have brought before them. I would appeal to the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill). Here is an opportunity for him to carry out, to some extent, his grand professions with regard to Ireland, without troubling the Royal Commission which is to consider the best means of developing the material resources of that country. I would remind him that it is in his power, by the exercise of his influence, to induce this Department, over which the Surveyor General of Ordnance presides, to get this Vote for Pimlico reduced by a certain sum, so as to give out more work to contract, and nurse these establishments in time of peace, so as to be of incalculable service to him in time of war.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £396,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."—(*Mr. John O'Connor.*)

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I am sorry that nobody rises from the Government Bench to reply to the observations of my hon. Friend, because I think his complaint is extremely well-founded. To show how well-founded it is, I have taken out from the last Return figures as to the distribution of the Vote last year but one. There was then, as there is now, £60,000 for piece-work at the Government Factory, and for work outside Pimlico £20,000; but whereas the £60,000 was not only spent, but was exceeded by more than £10,000, the sum of £30,000 taken for contract was not expended, but some £1,800 was returned into the Exchequer. It was clearly understood in previous years in this Committee that the whole £20,000 at least should be expended in contract services, and that if any economy was to be made in the sum voted it should be rather in the amount taken for Pimlico than in that taken for work by contract outside Pimlico. I find that instead of that being done, Mr. Ramsey, a thorough official obstructive, and a strong-minded old gentleman, has had his way, as he always has had his way. The officials at the head of the Department appear to be afraid of him. He has never carried out the assurances given to hon. Gentlemen in the House; but year after year we get the same experience. He constantly throws in the way of the contractors the same difficulties. He will reject garments on the slightest excuse, for the most minute deviation from the pattern, though they may be much better than the pattern. His system seems to be to worry the contractors by every means in his power, in order, if possible, to drive them out of the business. His object seems to be to make his own place—that is to say, the Government Factory—the only establishment in the country for the manufacture of Army clothing. He wishes to increase the importance of Pimlico. That is a very natural desire, no doubt; but if it were realized it would be anything but a good thing for the State, for the Government finds it can put work out and get it done quite as well and cheaper. I wish to call attention on this Vote to a falling-off in the amount of clothing in hand, as I drew attention, on a previous Vote, to the falling-off in general stores. As according to a Return supplied to us the general stores, valued at £12,500,000, sank one year by £1,100,000; so the clothing stores, which on the 31st of March, 1884, were valued at £813,000, on the 31st of March, 1885, had sunk to £618,000, or nearly £200,000, or 25 per cent of the whole. This is another case of depleted stores. We are supposed to have garments, badges, boots, and all sorts of clothing in store, available for use in any emergency that may arise, of the value of £800,000; but we find that when some exceptional draft is made by the Army at the end of the year 25 per cent of these stores have disappeared, and have not been replaced. This is a matter which, seeing the menacing condition of things in the East of Europe, deserves the closest attention of Her Majesty's Government.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): With reference to the position of the War Office in regard to the Auxiliary Forces Uniform and Equipment Company, I should like to remind the Committee that the hon. Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor), in the quotation he made, left out a very important part of Mr. Guy Dawnay's answer to the then hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) last year. Mr. Guy Dawnay said that work executed at the Limerick Factory usually, but not invariably, cost less than work executed at Pimlico; and he went on to say—

> "But, as regards reduction of workpeople, a large reduction will have to be made at Pimlico, and Limerick can scarcely hope to escape one also."

Then the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) asked—

> "Are we to understand that, if the work can be done cheaper than at Pimlico, Limerick will not suffer?"

in reply to which Mr. Guy Dawnay said—

> "Yes; Limerick will not suffer at all."—(3 *Hansard*, [300] 1458.)

There was a redemption, as far as possible, of the pledge given by Mr. Guy Dawnay in the autumn of 1885, for at the request of the Earl of Carnarvon, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, a further order was given to the Auxiliary Forces Uniform and Equipment Company with the object of keeping the hands in Limerick employed. An order for 14,000 garments was given for this purpose. I am informed that since August, 1885, the Company have had 166,000 garments issued to them at an estimated value to them of about £12,500. But as regards the general question raised by the interpretation the hon. Member put on Mr. Guy Dawnay's answer, I do not think that answer can be considered as extending so far as the Limerick Company seek to make out. If it did it would really amount to this—that Mr. Guy Dawnay gave an answer to a Question on the spur of the moment overthrowing the decision arrived at by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers) in 1880, after a full inquiry into the question of the capacity of our manufacturing establishment at Pimlico. The decision the right hon. Gentleman then came to was that the factory at Pimlico could best be worked with an establishment of 1,250 hands, or, allowing 50 to be absent from illness or other causes, with a normal establishment of 1,200 hands. When Mr. Guy Dawnay gave his answer last year to the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), we had, as a matter of fact, over 1,400 employed at Pimlico, and the interpretation placed by the Department on the promise of Mr. Guy Dawnay was that Limerick should not be made to suffer whilst anything like an abnormal rate of employment obtained in Pimlico. As a matter of fact, as I stated in the early part of the evening, we have reduced the number of hands employed at Pimlico by 334. The number employed there, I am told, was 1,084 on the 1st of September, 1886, as against 1,418 on the 1st of September, 1885. I may also say that in the spring of 1885 we had 2,100 hands employed; therefore, although it is unquestionably, I am afraid, the case that Limerick does suffer by the fact that there are no such special demands for these manufactures as exist in time of war, yet it cannot, I think, be said that Limerick has suffered unfairly as compared with the Government Factory, when it is considered that we have only 1,084 hands, as against 2,100 a year and a-half ago. As to the complaint of the Limerick Factory that only £15,000 is allotted to the trade, the fact is that at this moment, out of the £20,000 allotted for wages, we have liabilities out to the amount of £19,964; but of that a sum of £4,450 is on account of orders which the trade failed to deliver in the last financial year, and which we have had to charge against the present financial year. That is an occurrence which, I hope, will not be repeated, and in the next financial year I hope we shall be able to distribute the whole sum amongst the trade. If we can, certainly the trade of Limerick will be fairly considered. Of the £15,514 issued to the trade, I am informed that the Limerick Company have nearly £12,000. They have for the current year orders for 153,500 garments, or a daily average of 500; but we shall have no more work to give until the demands are made for next year, which will be issued in November. I could not, for the sole sake of helping the Limerick Factory, recommend the Secretary of State to take steps which would cripple Pimlico, which would be the case if a serious reduction in its present amount of work were reduced, because it must be remembered that though the work turned out at Limerick is on the whole cheaper than that done at Pimlico, yet that it is of a rougher kind. If we were to allow our great Clothing Factory to be shut up we should, I am afraid, be running the risk of getting into the hands of a ring of contractors who might take the opportunity of squeezing the Government if an emergency arose. Then it must be remembered by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite, that the War Office have not only to consider the complaints that come from the Limerick Factory, but that there are other contractors, and that these other contractors are somewhat inclined to grumble at what they consider the excessive amount of such contract work as we are able to give out which the Limerick Company secures. [An hon. MEMBER: Try competition.] With regard to the question put by the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) that the work done at the Pimlico Factory might be performed at a cheaper rate by having it put out to contract, I should be very unwilling to incur the risk. I should be unwilling to have it said that I was recommending the Secretary of State to obtain what is called "sweating" work—namely, work performed by the workpeople of London and elsewhere at starvation wages. With regard to the inconvenience caused to the Factory by the non-delivery of materials, I believe that such steps as we could take have been taken to meet the views of the contractors, and that whereas they complained that we only issued materials monthly, and they wanted a weekly distribution, we were able to compromise the matter by a fortnightly distribution. It does not lie entirely with the War Office to distribute or not, as fancy may guide them; but they have to be led by circumstances, and at one time they may have very little work to give, whilst at another time they may have a great deal to send out at a moment's notice. Some reference has been made in the course of the debate to the visit of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers) to the Limerick Factory, and it was said that it was represented to him that all the Limerick Factory claimed was that it should have work given to it to keep its hands going throughout the year. Well, Sir, when the right hon. Gentleman was over there a letter was written by the manager of the Limerick Factory on the 9th of July, 1880, stating that the number of hands employed there was 600, and that wages amounting to £10,000 would keep them in work for a year. The hon. Member for South Tipperary, (Mr. J. O'Connor) now says that that Factory has something like doubled its number of hands. While that Factory has so increased its hands, the Government have not been able or have not been in a position to double the orders which we previously gave. No undertaking was given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers) that if there was an unlimited increase in the number of hands in the Factory, sufficient work would be found for such increase. Then, I would remind the Committee that the special war preparations, to which reference has been made, not only gave work to the Limerick Factory, and our own Factory at Pimlico, but enabled us to give employment to firms in Norwich, Ipswich, Colchester, Derby, Chester, and Newcastle-under-Lyme. The ceasing of these war preparations, of course, necessitated our taking away work from the majority of these towns. But the fact that in the time of need we were able to obtain work from these places rather consoles one for the alarm one might feel at the statements of hon. Members in reference to our being left to the tender mercies of the Pimlico Factory in time of emergency. Though I do not wish to disparage the quality of work at Pimlico and Limerick, what I have said shows that there are other places we could avail ourselves of in time of need. During the present year I hope we shall be able to give the total amount of work—that is, £20,000 worth—out to contract. Though I cannot take the same view of the duty of the Government towards the Limerick Factory that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. J. O'Connor) very naturally takes himself, yet I do not think, from such conversation as I have been able to have with the officials at the War Office, that there does exist that prejudice towards this particular Factory which he seems to apprehend. I have not yet had an opportunity of seeing this formidable Director of Clothing to whom reference has been made; he is just now taking his annual holiday. But, I can assure the hon. Member that when I have made this gentleman's acquaintance, I will press upon him the view, which I am sure he will be anxious to take, that orders shall be given out with the utmost fairness, and with due regard to the prosperity of the Limerick Factory.

Mr. CHILDERS (Edinburgh, S.): As some reference has been made to me by the hon. Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) and by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down—to whose explanation I have listened with great care—I should like to give a short explanation to the Committee as to what occurred in this matter when I was Secretary of State. The facts are these. A short time after I became Secretary of State, in 1880, I found that there were great difficulties both as to the Pimlico and Limerick Factories, and as to the work given out to contract in the East of London, and other places. The Pimlico Factory had just gone through a great controversy as to the wages paid to the women employed there. The Limerick Factory was also the subject of controversy. The financial position of the latter Factory led to its being strongly urged upon me that it should be granted regular work, and I was quite satisfied before I went to Limerick that regular work ought, if possible, to be given. At the same time, I was by no means satisfied with the work in some other places where clothing was being produced, because it was then represented to me that "sweating" was going on, which we could not approve. I went fully into the business of the Pimlico Factory, and I obtained all the information I could concerning the Limerick Factory, which I personally inspected with some minuteness, and other places where work was done; and I came to the conclusion that on the one hand it was necessary, on economical grounds, that a minimum of—I think the hon. Gentleman says—1,200 persons should be employed at Pimlico, and that at the same time at Limerick there should be such a system of contract as would ensure the Factory having work for three years ahead. It appeared to me that if the requirements of these two establishments were properly treated the question of work at other places was of very minor importance, because I was satisfied that if a great demand for clothing arose through war, or other cause, it was perfectly easy to give out an almost infinite amount of work not only in the East of London, but in other places. On that ground I arrived at the conclusion which has been generally approved to-day. There was a special reason, both in the interests of economy and of the proper supply of garments when wanted, that the Pimlico Factory should not stand alone, but that competition of an efficient character, such as that afforded by the Limerick Factory, should be assured to us. It seemed to me that Limerick should not be allowed to get into that state of disorder through want of work which had previously, more than once, occurred. During the two years that followed I satisfied myself that the requisites that I insisted upon were carried out. Since that time I know nothing officially of the matter, but I believe that the statement of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is correct.

MR. W. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.): I desire to say a few words upon this Vote, as I happen to have some personal knowledge and experience of the Limerick Factory, having been for some 10 years the manager of that establishment. I was manager during the Civil War in America and the Franco-German War. It is stated by the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of Ordnance that some 600 persons were formerly employed at the Limerick Factory, and that that number has now been doubled. I wish to state for the hon. Member's information that the number of hands employed does not exceed 800. The ground upon which we ask that Ireland should obtain a three years' contract for the manufacture of all those garments which in competition they have been found capable of producing at a cheaper rate than the Pimlico Factory is the ground of right and justice. We ask that this Committee and the Government should undertake, on the representations which we make, in the interests of the Public Service, that the manufacture of all those garments which the Limerick Factory is able to produce at a cheaper rate than the Pimlico Factory should be given out to the Limerick Factory for a period of three years. Surely the Committee is familiar with all the arguments which have been urged in support of this demand, for they have been used over and over again. I have heard it advanced from the Treasury Bench that supplies should be obtained from any place, even from a foreign country, if they can be purchased at a less cost than that for which they can be produced at home; and when we know that many of these garments can be got cheaper at Limerick than elsewhere, I contend that on their own showing the Government are bound to give the work to the Limerick Factory. To give the Committee some idea of the difference in cost between the Pimlico and the Limerick work, I may point out that in the case of tweed frocks for the Royal Artillery the Pimlico price is 12*s.* 4½*d.*, while the Limerick price, delivered in London, is 12*s.* 1*d.*; that the Pimlico price for frocks for the Royal Engineers is 11*s.* 3½*d.*, while the Limerick contract price is 9*s.* 4*d.*; that the kersey Infantry frocks cost 8*s.* 8½*d.* at Pimlico, while the contract price at Limerick is 7*s.* 10*d.*; that at Pimlico the tweed trousers for the Royal Engineers cost 9*s.* 9*d.*, while the Limerick price is 9*s.* 1*d.*; and that the tartan Royal Artillery trousers cost 7*s.* 7½*d.* at Pimlico, whilst the charge is only 6*s.* 11*d.* at Limerick. We have gone very carefully into a calculation on this subject, and we find that the effect of having these garments made at Pimlico instead of giving them to the Limerick Factory actually involves the country in a loss of some £5,000 a-year. I assert without fear of contradiction that since the Government Factory was established in South Belgravia—a most extraordinary place for such a factory—the Government have paid £1,000,000 more than they need have done if they had had the work done by private contract even in London. Why, look at the salaries which are paid! There is a Director of Clothing at a salary of £1,200 a-year, an Assistant Director at a salary of £825 a-year, and a Factory Manager at £500 a-year. I suppose that there is nothing that this Factory makes in which it is able to compete with contractors in other parts of the country. We are promised a Commission of Inquiry into Irish industries. Well, here is an Irish industry in regard to which we want no inquiry. If the managers of the Limerick Factory are able—by the skill and intelligence which they have brought to bear on their establishment in the course of their 30 years' experience, and the long training they have given to their hands—to compete with the general trade and to effect a saving of £5,000 a-year, in those articles for the manufacture of which they compete, over a great Government establishment, I cannot believe that, speaking in an Assembly composed for the most part of commercial men, our claim will not receive general support. Our claim must be recognized as one which cannot be denied by any Government. It is a claim which is founded upon right and justice, and we confidently believe that it will be recognized. We ask that for all those garments that we can contract for at a less price than they can be produced for at the Pimlico Factory, we should have a contract for three years. There is plenty of work to be done at Pimlico besides that which we claim should be given to us. We cannot accept the statement of the Surveyor General of Ordnance as to the manner in which the material is given out, our contention being that the contract has been divided, or rather that the material has been distributed, over a period of 12 months, with the idea of hampering and injuring this Limerick industry. The cloth issued would only make 9,400 garments per month—that is to say, only a fortnight's work was given out to keep the Limerick Factory employed a month. We say, therefore, that there has been an attempt to stifle the Limerick industry, and we confidently appeal to the Government to properly redress this grievance.

Mr. WOODALL (Hanley): I am quite sure that the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, who appealed to this Committee for justice, may expect to have even more than justice in regard to our dealings with this industry in Limerick. But, if I may be allowed to offer him a piece of advice, it would be that he should not base his claim on the desirability of buying in the cheapest market. During the time I was at the War Office I learned that there are many firms throughout the country who send in tenders considerably lower than those of the Limerick Factory. There are many factories in the country, conducted on the best principles, which can see their way to do the work at much lower prices merely for the sake of keeping their hands employed and their works open for other and more lucrative purposes. Reference has been made to the inconvenient way in which the material has been given out to the Limerick Factory for the execution of orders intrusted to that factory. The Committee is not, perhaps, aware of the fact that the contracts for this kind of work are merely for the labour and the making up of material which is obtained from the various manufacturers in the country. These contracts are subject to regulations as to the time of delivery; and it certainly has appeared to me inconvenient that these regulations for the delivery of material to the clothiers should be on a different scale to that upon which the cloth made by contract is delivered to the Government. This was one of the matters on which it was extremely desirable that we should meet the convenience of the factory. I arranged, I believe, that the cloth, instead of being given out month by month, should be given out by arrangements extending over periods of three months. Application, however, has been made from Limerick, saying—"You give us a contract for a certain number of garments to be delivered in 12 months. Why limit us to deliver so many garments month by month? Why not allow us to deliver at any convenient period within the year?" Well, hon. Gentlemen have complained that the factory is kept at starvation wages, and that the hands can only be kept on half-time; and I am afraid that it would not be much of an improvement, so far as the men are concerned, if a 12 months' contract were allowed to be executed in six months. It is perfectly impossible; and I am sure in this the Committee will agree with me, that we should undertake to keep the Limerick Factory fully employed in production. It has been explained that an arrangement has been made by which the Pimlico Factory should be kept at a certain minimum rate of production which will enable it to be carried on efficiently and economically. According to the arrangements which have been made the work performed at this factory is a certain proportion of the ordinary average consumption in time of peace. That arrangement, I venture to say, has been honourably maintained; and while the strictest and most kindly regard has been shown towards the Limerick Factory, it has only been done by completely closing contracts with other factories which have relied on Government orders —factories in places like Derby, Chester, and Norwich, not to speak of very important clothiers in different parts of London. In regard to this subject, it should be remembered, also, that there has not only been a desire to hold the balance between the Government Factory and the private factories, but also there has been a very serious desire that, in trusting work to outside contractors, strict regard should be had to the conditions under which the work was done. The rule at present applying is that no contracts shall be issued to any contractor who will not undertake to have the work done under all the conditions required by the Factory Acts; and it has been, as the Committee will readily imagine, a matter requiring the greatest vigilance and care to prevent these contracts getting into the hands of people who are well known as "sweaters." But, as I think I have already stated, there are circumstances from time time which lead private contractors to tender for large orders of this kind in order to keep their workpeople employed and their machinery going. I can assure my hon. Friend the Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) that the prices tendered by the Limerick Factory have been, in a very large number of cases, beaten down by competitors in London and other parts of the country. But the hon. Gentleman has spoken of the cost of the administration of the Pimlico Factory. He must remember that the Pimlico Establishment is not merely a factory. It is a place that has large duties in the way of passing, testing, and examining, not merely clothing such as that which is made at Limerick, but boots and accoutrements in great variety, for the Police, the Post Office, and other Departments of the State. I am sure that everyone who visits that factory will be greatly impressed with the care, conscientiousness, and strictness with which it is carried out. I was half prepared to hear a revival to-night of the complaints made last year as to the treatment of the *employés* at this factory. I am glad to find that that complaint is suspended. That was a matter which required a great deal of careful investigation. I had the extreme good fortune to induce Mrs. Fawcett, the widow of the late Professor Fawcett, to undertake a very strict and confidential inquiry. I am sure the Government are extremely indebted to that able lady for the good advice she has given, and the Report she has made, upon which we have been enabled to make arrangements which have smoothed away a great many of the differences which existed, rather in apprehension than in fact, and which have had the effect of restoring the administration of that factory to a perfectly healthy and satisfactory condition.

MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down says there are many English firms who would have done this Government work at a cheaper rate than the Limerick Factory. Then, I ask, why did not the Department give the work to those firms? Was not the work submitted to competition, and was it not because Limerick won that it was given to Limerick? I certainly believe it was. And now that the Limerick Factory is, as I might say, the only private establishment to which this work can be given, the object seems to be to starve out that establishment, so that all the work will be brought to Pimlico. We from Ireland contend that the Limerick Factory has been getting very little support from the Government, and that they have found it impossible, no matter what sweating process was adopted, to get the work done in England as cheaply and as well as it is performed in Limerick. We say that, notwithstanding that fact, a great deal more work is given to Pimlico than formerly at a higher price than is charged in Limerick. Has it not been proved over and over again by hon. Gentlemen near me that the Pimlico Factory is being asked to do work which could be done cheaper in Ireland? I hope the English Members appreciate the fact that they are able to keep their money at home, but we Home Rulers insist that a greater share of this expenditure should go to Ireland. We have been voting a great deal of money here to-day—over £1,000,000—every 1*d.* of which is to be spent in England; but here is a Vote in regard to which we find that the gap can be opened and money can be spent with no loss but with great advantage to the State in Ireland instead of England. We ask that this money should be spent in Ireland. We are not asking you to make us a gift, but we are simply asking the guardians of the public purse to do that which they have a right to do in the interest of the public. Members of the Government say—"If you do this you will starve Pimlico and close it up, and then when it is closed up you will have Limerick and other factories forming themselves into a kind of ring." But I would point out that compliance with the demands made by the Irish Members would not have the effect of closing up the Pimlico Factory. You can reduce your hands in the Government Establishment—you need not close it up. The Government could start their Pimlico Factory again at any time they liked—at any moment of pressure; and if at any time manufacturers outside formed themselves into a ring, as the hon. Member opposite fears they would be inclined to do, the Government could bid Pimlico to arise and Pimlico would do so. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] It would be very easy for the Government at any moment to call into existence such a factory as that in Pimlico. As a matter of fact, this plea on the part of the Government will not hold; and I would ask Radical Members on this side of the House, and also hon. Gentlemen on the other side, who have recently in the Elections been posing before the constituents as Gentleman desirous of saving the pockets of the ratepayers, whether they do not think this a singular method of effecting economy? Why, you are really putting your hands in the pockets of the ratepayers. I hope my hon. Friend (Mr. J. O'Connor) will go to a division and use all the Forms of the House to oppose the Vote. We have not got any satisfactory answer, and I think we have a right to receive such an answer.

Mr. P. McDONALD (Sligo, N.): On two grounds I claim that Ireland has a right to expect the Government to give it the preference we ask. The first is the ground of economy, and the second is the development of the material resources of Ireland, to bring about which the Government have expressed their desire to do everything in their power. My hon. Friend the Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) has very clearly pointed out that a saving of from 15 to 40 per cent would accrue to the Government if they gave the contract to the Limerick Factory instead of to the Pimlico Establishment, and that thereby they would effect a saving to the taxpayers of the country of at least £5,000. I maintain that it is the absolute duty of the Department to give the contract for Army clothing to the establishment which can produce the garments at the cheapest price. But I place the claims of the Limerick Factory upon a higher ground. It is the duty of a Government which professes to exercise a paternal and fostering influence over Ireland at the present time to encourage the growing industries of the country, especially those of Limerick, as being most needful in that respect. We have shown that we stand on an equal footing with the manufacturers of England, both as regards price and quality of material. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Hanley (Mr. Woodall) has said that there are several manufacturers in England who can compete successfully with Limerick. I call upon him to name the manufacturers, and to inform us why, under such circumstances, they do not get a contract. Why did Limerick get a contract? Not because it was Limerick, but simply on account of the quality of its work. The execution of this contract is an important matter to a city such as Limerick, which has a large population, and a population requiring employment. From a social point of view it is the duty of the Government, which, as I have already said, professes to be a paternal Government, to find employment for the people. Moreover, I consider that it is not generous of the Government—not alone of the present, but of the last Government—to hold on to those hampering conditions which have impeded the action of the Limerick Factory, and prevented it executing its work in the manner which would be most convenient to them while not disadvantageous to the country. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) to have regard to the efficiency of the Limerick Factory, and to bear in mind that the establishment has hitherto executed in a most satisfactory manner the work entrusted to it. I hope there will be a continuance of the contracts, not merely because they are executed at as cheap or cheaper rate than they are at Pimlico, but because the manufacture of garments is one of the few industries of Ireland, and every encouragement should be given to a struggling people.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I certainly do not believe, with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, that it is the duty of a Government, paternal or otherwise, to find employment for the people; but still I am bound to say that, having listened to this discussion, I do not think the case fairly made for Limerick has been answered by either of the Front Benches, and, therefore, if the hon. Member (Mr. J. O'Connor) goes to a division, I shall support him. It is not what the thing can be done for, as the hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Woodall) put it, but what the thing is done for, and the case made here to-night proves that the Limerick tenders were lower than those accepted from other establishments. On that ground I shall support the hon. Gentleman if he goes to a division.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I wish to make a few observations in relation to the remarks of the late Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Woodall). The hon. Gentleman said that the establishment at Pimlico was large and varied. If that be so, the establishment at Pimlico can better afford to share other contracts with the Limerick Factory. He (Mr. Woodall) also said that he had a very kindly regard for Limerick. I would like to know what that kindly regard amounted to. So far as we can gather it amounted to very little; it was in words more than in deeds. What we want is that if there be a kindly regard for Limerick it should take the form of deeds and not words. But the advocates of Limerick do not want any special favour from the Government, so far as I can see. They stand upon their own merits, and all they ask is that they should be given work when their tenders are lower than the tenders of other people, or as low as Pimlico. That is a very fair and reasonable proposition, and I do not see how the Committee can get over it. If you are disposed to deal fairly, justly, and generously with Ireland, and indeed honestly with the ratepayers of this country, I do not see how you can get over the proposition that you should give work to Limerick when her tender for that work is lower than that of any other firm. I therefore appeal to the Government and to the Committee to give to Limerick the work for which her tender is lower than that of any other firm.

MR. WOODALL (Hanley): I must have been very obscure in my remarks for it to be possible for the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jordan) to have completely misunderstood me. We have not only given Limerick orders when there have been lower tenders from other places, but I assure the Committee we have given Limerick work which has occupied them six weeks longer than the time originally agreed upon.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): In future will work be given to Limerick when their tenders are lower than those of other firms?

MR. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.): I do not intend to prolong the discussion very much; but I certainly must say that, after having listened to the speeches made here, to-night, I, as an Irishman, feel slightly humiliated, for, after all, the amount of money which my hon. Friends ask should be spent in Ireland is very trivial. With regard to what the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hanley, (Mr. Woodall) said as to the work done in other parts of the country, I should like to know if clothing which was tendered for in this way was like that supplied by English contractors to the French Army during the Franco-German War, because the garments so supplied literally fell to pieces? The managers of the Limerick Factory have satisfied the Gentlemen who occupy the Front Opposition Bench that they cannot only do this work cheaply, but upon a good principle. It is a notorious fact that in connection with the manufacture of clothing for an Army, especially in view of war, there is an enormous amount of peculation, besides bad work being done. At Limerick you have a factory which is able to do work well and do it quickly, and it only asks for a fair share of support from the Government. During the course of the discussion upon the Estimates to-night it has been contended that inasmuch as Ireland is not allowed to have a Volunteer Force of her own, but is forced to contribute towards the maintenance of the Volunteer Force in England and Scotland, she ought to be granted some equivalent. In a small matter of this kind you have a ready means of showing that you are willing to do something to recognize the claims of Ireland, and I earnestly hope that some assurance will be given from the Treasury Bench that the views of the Irish Members in this matter will be met.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I have but one remark to make, and it is that there is the strongest desire on the part of the Department to recognize the claims of labour in Ireland and of the Limerick Factory, and everything that can possibly be done in that direction will be done.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): So far as the discussion has been conducted on this side of the House I am very well satisfied with it. There is a consensus of opinion that something ought to be done for the Limerick Factory, and I trust that I have not made my Motion in vain. But, while I am satisfied with the discussion on this side of the House, I am not at all satisfied with the expressions of the Ministry, for what have we got, after all, but a Minister's promise? ["Oh!"] Well, a Minister's promise may be much to some people, but in regard to Ireland it has not amounted to much up to the present. A Ministry propose, but the constituencies very often dispose. We have appealed in this matter.—[*Cries of* "Divide, divide!" *and* "Adjourn, adjourn!"]

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I rise to Order, Mr. Courtney. Seeing the excited state of the Committee ——

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

MR. J. O'CONNOR: I was about to say, Mr. Courtney, that we have appealed in this matter on certain grounds. We have appealed on the ground that it is in the interest of the Public Service that additional contracts for Army clothing should be given out to the Limerick Factory. We have appealed on the ground of economy, and we have proved our case. We have appealed on the grouud that Ireland contributes much to the Imperial Exchequer. What have we got as a result of the discussion? An admission from the Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote)—an admission that is very valuable to us —that there are certain rough clothes that can be made in Limerick cheaper and better than elsewhere. Now, all we ask is to be permitted to make these rough garments. Give us the rough garments to make, and keep the fine clothes for your splendid Establishment in Pimlico. Well, as I have said, the admission is worth something to us; and I trust the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) will act upon it. However, I do not feel at all inclined to withdraw my opposition to the Vote, recollecting, as I do, that the Government of this country have made many promises with regard to Ireland, and that those promises have scarcely ever been fulfilled. It is quite true that we are very like Lazarus, waiting for the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. Our case is a very good one; and, as a protest against the manner in which we are treated in this respect, I propose to divide the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 51; Noes 152: Majority 101.—(Div. List, No. 15.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL.—[BILL 35.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): We had no expectation that this Bill would be taken to-night. I consulted the right hon. and learned Gentleman on the subject, and I certainly understood the Bill would not be taken to-night.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I think there is some misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Gentleman. I told the hon. Gentleman I did not know what time the Bill could be brought on, but that as the block had been removed, I was under the impression that the hon. Member and his Friends were anxious to advance the Bill a stage.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I was one of the Members who blocked this Bill, and I distinctly deny that I have removed the block. I blocked the Bill again this evening, and I consider I was perfectly justified in doing so. If I think, as I do, that the Bill is not conceived in a proper spirit, and that it is not likely to be administered in a proper spirit, I maintain I am within my right in blocking it. I certainly shall do the same with any measure. [*A laugh.*] Hon. Members may laugh.

They are perfectly at liberty to laugh; but still I maintain that, holding the views I do, I was justified in taking the course I did. To block Bills of which they disapprove is one of the special privileges which are conferred on Members of this House. I have not removed the block, and I have no intention of doing so.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Perhaps I may appeal to my hon. Friends not to renew their blocks. I am sure we shall have no objection to take the Bill at a reasonable hour to-morrow.

Second Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 7th September, 1886.

MINUTES.]—PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*First Reading*—Gas (No. 2)* (16); Public Health (Scotland) (Urray Water)* (17); Tramways (No. 2)* (18); Tramways (No. 3)* (19).

Committee—Report—Local Government (No. 7)* (3); Local Government (No. 8)* (4); Local Government (No. 9)* (5); Local Government (No. 10)* (6); Local Government (No. 11)* (7); Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2)* (8).

Report—Local Government (Highways)* (168); Local Government (No. 5)* (172).

Third Reading—Local Government (Poor Law) (No. 7)* (169); Local Government (County Divisions)* (167); Local Government (Gas)* (189); Local Government (No. 3)* (170); Local Government (No. 6)* (190); Pier and Harbour* (191); Tramways (No. 1)* (192), and *passed.*

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales—Singly took the Oath.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and Strathearn—Singly took the Oath.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

Their Lordships met;—and having gone through the Business on the Paper without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 7th September, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—ARMY ESTIMATES, Votes 12 to 25.

Resolutions [September 6] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Metropolitan Poor* [44].

Second Reading — Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry [35].

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*Report*—*Considered as amended*—*Third Reading*—Gas (No. 2)* [214]; Tramways (No. 2)* [208]; Tramways (No. 3)* [213]; Public Health (Scotland) (Urray Water)* [279], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—NUMBERS AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, S.W., Bootle) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total numerical strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary in officers, sergeants, and constables; and, what are the number of Roman Catholics employed in the Force, in each of these grades respectively, at the present time?

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total numerical strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary in officers, sergeants, and constables; and, what is the number of Roman Catholics and of Protestants (distinguishing Episcopalians from Presbyterians) in each of these grades respectively, at the present time?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The total strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary is as follows:—Officers, 275; head constables, 249; sergeants and acting sergeants, 2,586; constables, 9,750. The distribution as to religious professions, omitting a few individuals who belong to other minor persuasions, is—of officers, 50 Roman Catholics, 216 Episcopalians, six Presbyterians; of head constables, 169 Roman Catholics, 69 Episcopalians, 10 Presbyterians; of sergeants and acting sergeants, 1,801 Roman Catholics, 650 Episcopalians, 115 Presbyterians; and of constables, 7,318 Roman Catholics, 1,963 Episcopalians, 429 Presbyterians.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) ACT—CONDITION OF TEACHERS.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any materal improvement has taken place in the condition of the National School Teachers of Ireland since the following resolution was unanimously passed by Parliament in the year 1878:—

> "That the National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, and the other means adopted by the Government having failed to satisfy the just demands of the Irish National School Teachers, this House is of opinion that the present position of the Irish National School Teachers calls for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to the satisfactory adjustment of their claims;"

and, whether, if no such improvement has taken place, the Government will see their way to bringing forward a Supplementary Estimate to make further provision for the proper maintenance and remuneration of this class of public servants?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It is hardly possible to give a satisfactory reply on this subject within the limits of an answer to a Question; but I may state generally that with respect to class salaries, results fees, pensions, assistance in building residences and facilities for training, the position of the teachers has been very materially improved since 1878. There is no intention on the part of the Irish Government to ask the Treasury to submit a Supplementary Estimate to the House.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — THE MILITIA TRAINING — INSTRUCTION FOR MILITIA REGIMENTS.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devon, Ashburton) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, having regard to the waste of time involved in practising obsolete movements of battalion drill by regiments of Militia during their training, and to the absence of any systematic instruction of Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers of that force with a view to its efficiency for defensive purposes, and to the fact that out of the ninety Militia Battalions exercised in musketry last year, seventy-one are classified as only "moderate" or "bad," he will take into consideration, before the next period of training, the advisability of establishing an improved course of instruction for Militia regiments?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The subject of musketry instruction in the Militia has already been taken into consideration with a view to increasing the efficiency of the Force, and one of the points to which attention has been directed is that of devoting more time, if possible, to musketry instruction.

LAW AND JUSTICE—STREET SPEAKING—CASE OF JOHN WILLIAMS.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in the case of John Williams, now undergoing two months' imprisonment for speaking in the public streets, he will advise a remission of the remainder of the sentence, having in view the fact that, though many hundreds of similar technical offences have been committed in the Metropolis during the past few years, this is the first case which has been made the subject of an indictment at Common Law?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): In reply to the hon. Member, I would first point out that the prisoner, John Williams, was convicted, not of speaking in the streets, but of obstructing a public thoroughfare. That this was not a merely technical offence, as the hon. Member implies, is, I think, shown by the fact that the prisoner was twice summarily convicted of a similar offence in 1885. The first time he was discharged on his own recognizances; the second time he was fined 40*s.*, with the alternative of a month's imprisonment; he elected to go to prison. On the 4th of July, of this year, he was again summarily convicted of the same offence, was fined 1*s.* and costs, and cautioned. Within a week the prisoner repeated the offence, collecting large crowds by the issue of placards, the avowed purpose of which was to protest against the action of the police and the decision of the magistrates. Under such circumstances, as the learned magistrate said, there was no option but to commit the prisoner for trial. The case of Williams is not different from that of any other person who persistently and wilfully obstructs the public streets. I have had submitted to me a Return of some recent prosecutions for obstruction, and I find among the offenders a preacher, a temperance lecturer, a Conservative politician, and a Home Ruler. All these gentlemen would, in the ordinary course, have been committed for trial had they persistently defied authority. I would further point out that Williams was sentenced to imprisonment only in default of paying a fine and finding sureties. He might obtain his discharge at any moment by obeying the order of the Court. Under all these circumstances, it is clearly, in my opinion, not a case in which to advise any interference.

INLAND REVENUE--INCOME TAX FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

Captain SELWYN (Cambridge, Wisbech) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether for purposes of taxation the incomes of married women who are engaged in trade or other occupations are regarded as the occupations of their husbands; and, if this be so, whether he will advise that steps be taken to enable the separate income of the wife to be separately assessed and charged?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): Yes, Sir; the Income Tax Law prescribes that the profits of any married woman living with her husband shall be deemed the profits of her husband for purposes of Income Tax, and shall be charged in the name of her husband. I am not prepared to recommend any change in the present law.

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—GLENGARUFFE DISPENSARY DISTRICT.

Mr. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) (for Mr. Gilhooly) (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Dr. Cotter, medical officer of health of the Glengaruffe dispensary district, resides at Bantry, which is fourteen miles from some portions of his district; if complaints have been made to Dr. O'Farrell, medical inspector to the Local Government Board for Ireland, of the inconvenience occasioned to the poor people of the Glengaruffe district by Dr. Cotter's residence at Bantry; and, whether the Local Government Board for Ireland will compel Dr. Cotter to reside at Glengaruffe henceforward?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board has reported in the sense mentioned, and the Board will require the Dispensary Doctor to take up his residence at Glengaruffe on or before the 15th of next month.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES) — CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS, NORTH WALES—THE FLINT ASSIZES.

Mr. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been called to the presentment made by the Grand Jury of the County of Flint at the last Summer Assize; whether it is the case that Her Majesty's Judge of Assize has, during the present year, twice visited Dolgelly, and that on neither occasion were there any prisoners for trial; whether three Assizes have been held during the same period at Carnarvon, two for the county, at which only one prisoner was tried, and one for the whole of North Wales, at which there were five cases in all; and, whether he will advise the adoption of a system of alternative Assize for North Wales, as recommended by the Grand Jury at Mold, or, if the scheme is impracticable, he will, during the ensuing Recess, consider the best method of relieving Her Majesty's Judges from the arduous nature of their duties?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): My attentlon has not been called to the presentment made by the Grand Jury of the county of Flint; but I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements mentioned in the Question. As regards the adoption of a system of alternative Assize, I must remind the hon. Member that any alteration of the Circuit arrangements involves a re-arrangement convenient to many counties, in some of which the requirements are wholly dissimilar; but the present arrangements for the Assizes are occupying the careful attention of the Lord Chancellor. It is, however, doubtful whether any scheme which would involve the discontinuance of any of the Assizes in the counties of Wales would meet with general approval.

SPAIN—THE "MARY MARK" COLLISION.

Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether in the matter of the *Mary Mark*, run down while at anchor by a Spanish man-of-war three years ago, the Foreign Office has sanctioned the interpretation of the International Regulations for the Prevention of Collision at Sea, laid down by the Naval Court at Havana, as applied to this case; whether it has conveyed to the Spanish Government the reply of the owners in May to the finding of the said Court; and whether any answer thereto has been received; whether it will submit the papers in this case to the Law Officers of the Crown for their opinion; and, what further steps, if any, Her Majesty's Government will take to obtain redress for the destruction of the property of a British subject, which for three years has been withheld?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E): Her Majesty's late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs concurred in the reply of the owners of this vessel referred to by my hon. Friend. Sir Clare Ford was accordingly instructed on the 18th of June last to make a communication to the Spanish Government supporting the contention of the owners, and to propose that the case should be referred either to the Admiralty Court in this country or to arbitration. Many representations have been made to the Spanish Government, who last year conducted a fresh inquiry, to which the reply mentioned by my hon. Friend has been made by the owners. The attention of Her Majesty's Minister will be again called to the subject. At present there does not appear to be any legal point to be submitted to the Law Officers.

ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—COLONEL HOPE'S GUN.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for War, If the authorities intend giving Colonal Hope any facilities for the testing of the new gun he is constructing, and for its trial against guns of the same or heavier calibre at present in use in Her Majesty's service; and, whether, if these trials prove the superiority of Colonel Hope's gun, it will be adopted for use in Her Majesty's service?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): If Colonel Hope submits his gun to the War Department for trial it will be tried in the usual way at Woolwich and Shoeburyness under the Ordnance Committee. Any subsequent steps would, of course, await their Report.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—SHOOTING AT THE PERSON, DERRYGONNELLY, CO. FERMANAGH.

Mr. JORDAN (Clare, W.) (for Mr. William Redmond) (Fermanagh, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Did the constabulary authorities at Derrygonnelly, county Fermanagh, report to the Government a shooting outrage which occurred at a place called Dromore, near Derrygonnelly, on the night of the 14th of July last, when a party of Nationalists were fired at while passing the house of one James Kerr (residing near Derrygonnelly), on their way home, and while passing along the public road [and consequential Questions]?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: I am now engaged in investigating this matter, and as it may result in further legal proceedings it would be inexpedient for me at present to make any statement as to the details contained in the Questions of the hon. Member.

DISPENSARIES (IRELAND)—ELY DISPENSARY.

Mr. JORDAN (Clare, W.) (for Mr. William Redmond) (Fermanagh, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Was there an Orange Lodge holding its meetings in the Ely Dispensary at the time when the Enniskillen Board of Guardians became tenants of the whole premises for the purpose of using said premises as a dispensary [and consequential Questions]?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he believed that a Question on this matter had been asked before, and he had himself stated it was one in which the Local Government in Ireland had no power to interfere. But he was informed that an Orange Lodge held its meetings in the house at Ely

Dispensary, Derrygonnelly, long before a portion of the premises was occupied as a dispensary. The original agreement of letting, dated May, 1852, was not forthcoming, but the present arrangement had been in force for over 30 years, and during that time there had never been any question that the landlord had let a portion of the building to an Orange Lodge. There was but one hall-way, which was used by all persons entering the house, and he was afraid he could not decide to which party this hall-way legally belonged. There was a caretaker in charge, but that person did not clean the room used by the Orange Lodge. It had never been denied that Orange flags had been displayed from the windows of that part of the house occupied by the Orange Lodge. Last week a Question had been asked whether an Orange flag was not displayed on a particular occasion, and he believed that he could correctly answer that in the negative.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—COUNTRY FAIRS (IRELAND).

MR. CAREW (Kildare, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that while a rigid system of inspection for the purpose of detecting disease in sheep and other animals is exercised at Dublin and other seaports, none is exercised at the fairs throughout the Country; whether in consequence purchasers at fairs who take their animals direct to Dublin, and before they have an opportunity of examining whether they are affected with disease, are often subjected to heavy fines; and, whether in view of the great danger of propagating disease under existing circumstances, he will order an extension of the system to the leading fairs to be held in the autumn?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There is a strict system of inspection by Government Veterinary Inspectors at all ports of Ireland from which animals are shipped, and no animal can be shipped until certified to be free from disease. There is no such system of Government inspection at fairs, except that an Inspector attends at Ballinasloe and other important fairs for the purpose of seeing that the provisions of the Order in Council as to cleansing and disinfection are carried out by the Railway Company, and to prevent overcrowding of animals in trucks. In Ireland, as in England, the districts in which fairs are held are under the control of the Local Authorities, whose duty it is to enforce the provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, and for this purpose they can appoint such officers as they deem necessary. These officers have authority to seize and detain any diseased animal exposed at a fair, and the person so exposing it is liable to a penalty. As regards the second paragraph of the Question, I believe the cases in which penalties have been imposed in Dublin under the circumstances mentioned are not numerous.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS—THE PENISTONE ACCIDENT—BRAKES ON THE MANCHESTER, SHEFFIELD, AND LINCOLNSHIRE RAILWAY.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been drawn to the accident on Wednesday night, September 1st, at Penistone Station, on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, when the greater part of an express train became detached, and starting down an incline came into violent collision with a goods waggon, and the buffer stops of the ticket platform siding; whether the train to which this accident occurred was not fitted with the same "simple vacuum" brake which was in use on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway two years ago, and the failure of which was demonstrated in the terribly fatal accident at Bullhouse, near Penistone, on the 16th of July 1884, when 24 persons were killed, and 62 persons injured; whether, in his Report of the investigation of the accident at Bullhouse on 16th July 1884, Major Marindin, the Inspector of the Board of Trade, used these words:—

> "The value of a brake having rapid action and, above all, automatic action, in such a case as this, can hardly be contested; and, although the Board of Trade has as yet no power to insist upon the adoption of a continuous brake possessing these qualities, yet I would remind the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company that this is the second emphatic warning which has been given to them within the last six months as to the need for automatic action in the brakes used upon their line; the previous instance being on the 6th of

February 1884, when, after a carriage had left the rails when running at high speed near Dinting Station, the vacuum brake pipe was severed, the brake became useless, and the carriage was dragged along off the rails for over 350 yards further than it would have been if the brakes had remained on, at the imminent risk of falling, and taking with it the carriages behind it, over a viaduct 100 feet in height."

and, whether, since the condemnation of these brakes by Major Marindin two years ago, the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company have ever given any explanation of this delay in carrying out the recommendations of the Board of Trade, or any engagement to carry them out?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: The Board of Trade have received a Report from the Company of the accident referred to, and have directed an inquiry to be held; but they have at present no information as to the form of brake with which the train was fitted. The words quoted in the Question were contained in Major Marindin's Report on the Bullhouse accident in 1884, a copy of which Report was forwarded to the Company. The Board of Trade have not since received any engagement from the Company with regard to the use of brakes of automatic action; but it appears from the Return presented to Parliament in pursuance of the Railway Returns (Continuous Brakes) Act, 1878, for the six months ending the 30th June, 1886, that the stock of the Company is fitted with the vacuum brake, which is not not automatic. If the hon. Member likes to move for a copy of the Correspondence, there is no objection to its being presented.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS)—SPLENETIC BLOOD POISONING AT ARNESBY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

MR. TAPLING (Leicestershire, Harborough) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether his attention has been called to the recent outbreak of splenetic apoplexy among cattle at Arnesby in Leicestershire; whether, of the men who were attending on the diseased cattle, one has since died of blood poisoning consequent upon contact with one of the animals, and several others have been taken seriously ill with similar symptoms; and, whether the Government will consider the advisability of taking steps to have this particular form of disease included within the limits of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.): The attention of the Agricultural Department has been called to the recent outbreak of anthrax among cattle at Arnesby, and to the unfortunate results affecting certain persons who were employed about the diseased cattle. An Order of Council making provision for dealing with the disease is now under consideration.

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS.

MR. BARRAN (York, W.R., Otley) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he can inform the House whether the decision of the Treasury on the case of the Civil Service Writers, which has been under consideration for over twelve months, will be made known before the close of the Session?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I must point out to my hon. Friend that I am not responsible for the fact that this matter has been under consideration for over 12 months. It is a very difficult question to settle satisfactorily; but I think I can safely promise that a statement bearing upon it will be made before the close of the Session.

POST OFFICE (SAVINGS BANKS)—THE SAVINGS BANK, HASTINGS—DOUBLE ACCOUNT.

MAJOR ROSS (Maidstone) asked the Postmaster General, Whether James Murdoch was, at the time of death last autumn, a depositor in the Post Office Savings Bank at Hastings; whether he had two accounts open in his own name, and whether any blame attaches to the postmaster at Hastings for allowing such an infringement of regulations; whether, last March, the Post Office authorities, on receiving explanations from the executor of the deceased, agreed to pay both accounts on the production of the probate of the will, and the performance of certain other requirements; whether the probate of the will has been sent to the office, and the other demands complied with; and, whether, on August 28th, the money remained unpaid to the executor; and, if so, what is the explanation for the long delay of six months dating from March, when the Post Office authorities had agreed to pay?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): The facts are mainly as stated by the hon. Member. It has already been explained to him that the case was one of an extremely complicated nature, and that there was great difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion that the depositor in both accounts was one and the same person, and even now it is not considered prudent to pay the money except under a bond of indemnity. As soon as this has been executed the money will be paid. No blame attaches to the Postmaster of Hastings in the matter of the two accounts, inasmuch as no records of Savings Bank business is retained by Provincial postmasters. There has been, no doubt, considerable delay in dealing with the question; but as in strictness the whole of the money was liable to forfeiture, doubtless the representatives of the deceased would rather undergo the inconvenience of delay than lose the whole amount. The bond has now been engrossed, and has been sent for execution, and the money will be paid as soon as possible.

Major ROSS also asked the Postmaster General, Whether the Postmaster at Hastings had among his records the two declarations signed by James Murdoch, according to Regulation 2 of the Post Office Savings Bank; whether the Controller, on March 9, wrote:—"It may be added that the required declarations will be prepared in this office;" and again, on June 21, "that the declaration should be prepared by you," *i.e.*, the solicitors; whether the one indemnity first required had been since increased to three; whether the probate of the will, after inspection by the Post Office authorities, was not returned to the solicitors on June 21; and whether, on August 28, the Controller wrote requesting the date of the will?

Mr. RAIKES: The answer to the first part of the Question is that the Postmaster General has the two declarations referred to. The Controller, on March 9, did write in the sense indicated, thinking the case might be dealt with in the ordinary way. The Solicitor, however, advised that he was in error. The answer to the third part of the Question is No. Only one bond of indemnity is wanted, but it has to be executed by three persons. The probate of the will was returned to Messrs. Meadows and Elliott on June 21, and the Controller wrote for the date of it on August 28, not having noted it.

INDIA (FINANCE, &c.)—IMPORT DUTY ON COTTON GOODS.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) (for Mr. W. L. Bright) (Stoke-upon-Trent) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether his attention has been drawn to a statement reported to have been made by Lord Harris at Manchester on Saturday—

> "That the financial affairs of that country (India) were in so critical a state that not improbably it might be necessary to reimpose the import duties on cotton goods;"

and, whether the Government intend to reconsider their resolution to lay the cost of the Burmese War entirely upon the Indian Revenues?

Mr. JENNINGS (Stockport) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been called to a statement made at a meeting near Manchester on Saturday by Lord Harris, Under Secretary of State for War, to the effect that—

> "The rulers of India might have to increase the revenue by reimposing a duty upon cotton goods, and that he hoped the people of Lancashire would look at it honestly, from an Indian point of view, for it was absolutely necessary for that country to have sufficient revenue;"

and, whether the Government have had under consideration the expediency of taxing English cotton goods imported into India?

Mr. ADDISON (Ashton-under-Lyne) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Indian Government contemplate reimposing any duty on cotton goods imported into India?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): My attention has been drawn to the statement by Lord Harris referred to. It appears from *The Times*' report that Lord Harris was careful to explain "that he had not been prompted in any way to say this; he only thought it was a possibility which might arise." Her Majesty's Government see no reason for reconsidering the resolution they have arrived at to charging the costs of the Burmese War upon Indian Revenues. Her Majesty's Government have not had under consideration, nor have the Government of India contemplated, the expediency of taxing cotton goods imported into India.

VACCINATION ACTS—PROSECUTIONS—FEES TO CLERKS OF BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

General Sir **GEORGE BALFOUR** (Kincardine) (for Mr. F. W. MACLEAN) (Oxford, Woodstock) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is consistent with the provisions of the Vaccination Acts, or the orders of the Board, that clerks to the Board of Guardians should attend before Justices at Petty Sessions to represent the Vaccination Officers in prosecutions under the Acts, and that their fees for attendance should be ordered to be paid by the defendant; if not, whether the proper authorities will take steps to prevent such fees being so ordered to be paid in future prosecutions under such Acts?

The **PRESIDENT** (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): There is nothing in the Statute or the Orders of the Local Government Board which would be inconsistent with the Vaccination Officer, when necessary, obtaining the assistance of a solicitor to represent him in a prosecution under the Vaccination Acts, although the solicitor may hold the office of Clerk to the Guardians. The question as to whether the costs of the attendance of the solicitor should be charged to the defendant is one which rests with the Justices to determine, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, and the Board cannot interfere with their discretion in the matter.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—MARYBOROUGH DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM.

Mr. **LALOR** (Queen's Co., Leix) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the late election of Doctor W. G. Jacob as Visiting Physician to the Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum, by the Board of Governors, If the Resident Medical Superintendent of the Asylum, Doctor Joseph Henry Hatchell, is uncle to the said Doctor W. G. Jacob, and the Government Inspector, Doctor G. W. Hatchell, father to the Resident Medical Superintendent; and, whether, considering the close family connection existing between these several parties, the Government is prepared to sanction the appointment of Doctor W. G. Jacob as Visiting Physician to this institution?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.) in reply, said, he was afraid he could not add anything as to the relationship between these gentlemen beyond the information he had already given to the House in answer to a previous Question. In taking into consideration the confirmation of the appointment, of course these circumstances would not be forgotten.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—"VAGRANTS AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD."

Mr. **PICKERSGILL** (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following paragraph, which appeared in *The Weekly Dispatch* of Saturday last:—

> "Greenwich.—Vagrants and the Local Government Board. Alfred Webb, 48, was charged before Mr. Balguy with refusing to perform his task-work while in St. Olave's Union casual ward, Rotherhithe. Mr. Palmer said the prisoner had a night's lodging, and on the following day did his task of work; but one of the visitors of the Local Government Board inspected the place, and recognised him as having been in a casual ward of the Metropolis twice before within the past month, and consequently he was told he would have to do two days more work. Mr. Balguy said a rule was passed by the Local Government Board, for some reason or other, that if a visitor recognised a man, or fancied he recognised him, as having been in a casual ward twice within the month, he could order his detention. Prisoner denied that he had been more than once in a casual ward in the month, upon which statement Mr. Balguy discharged him;"

what is the name and the salary of the visitor referred to; and, whether either "The Casual Poor Act, 1882," or the General Order of 18th December 1882, issued to carry out that Act, provides that the mere word of a visitor of the Local Government Board shall justify the detention of a casual pauper for two additional days; and, if not, under what authority Alfred Webb was so detained?

The **PRESIDENT** (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I have made inquiry as to the facts of the case referred to. The visiting officer by whom the man was identified, was Robert Armitage. He recives 30*s.* per week. It is the duty of the visiting officers to visit the casual wards in the Metropolis with a view of identifying the habitual vagrants, who, under the Statute and the orders of the Board, are liable to detention. The visiting officers do not order the detention of the casual pauper, but identify and point out to the superintendents of the wards the persons who are liable to detention. As regards the particular case alluded to, the man, when told by the visiting officer at the Rotherhithe ward on August 26 that he was in the Camberwell ward on the 31st of July, did not attempt to deny that such was the case. I understand that the man is well known to the visiting officers.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—REPORT FOR 1885—FISHERMEN'S HOUSES.

MR. DUFF (Banffshire) asked the Secretary for Scotland, If his attention has been called to the recommendations contained in the Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland for 1885, relative to the proposed facilities for granting fishermen titles to their houses; and, if the Government intend to take any action in the matter?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): My attention has been called to the subject referred to in the Question of the hon. Member; and I shall carefully consider how the state of things disclosed by the Report of the Fishery Board can be best remedied.

REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS (IRELAND) — REVISION COURT AT RAMELTON, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in view of the fact that a very large number of objections have been lodged for the electoral division of Ramelton, in East Donegal, arrangements will be made to have a sitting of the Revising Barrister at Ramelton itself, so as to prevent the great hardship of forcing many poor and old people from going all the way to Letterkenny to establish their right to the franchise?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University); It is now too late to make any alterations this year in the places for holding Revision Sessions in county Donegal; but any representations as to the desirability of holding such Sessions at Ramelton will be carefully considered before next year's revision.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS.

MR. RICHARD POWER (Waterford) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, next Session, he intends to renew the Motion which he placed on the Notice Paper last Session for the nomination of a Committee to inquire into the Appointment of Officers of the House of Commons, considering that such a Committee has not sat for forty years?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I must point out that the Notice to which he refers was given before I became a Member of Her Majesty's Government. My acceptance of Office will, I presume, preclude me from acting upon it without consulting my Colleagues on the subject. But there is no reason why the hon. Member, who enjoys a position of greater freedom and less responsibility, should not take up the question if he thinks proper to do so.

INDIA—ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA—A ROYAL COMMISSION.

SIR ROPER LETHBRIDGE (Kensington, N.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend to undertake an early inquiry into the Administration of India; and, if so, whether, considering the probable duration of the present Session, they will propose a Royal Commission, rather than a Parliamentary Committee; whether any, and what, measures will be taken to obtain a free and full expression of Native opinion; and, whether the inquiry will deal with the questions of the reorganisation of the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Civil Services, of extending the employment of Natives in the higher ranks of the Government Service, and of the annual migration of the Indian Governments to the hills?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham):

Her Majesty's Government have not altered the intention which was originally expressed by the noble Lord now the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to propose the appointment of a small Committee of both Houses of Parliament; and this will be done next Session with substantially the same terms of reference as were proposed by the late Government to the late Parliament. The Committee, if appointed, will determine whether measures are to be taken, and, if so, what measures, to obtain a full and free expression of Native opinion. With reference to the last part of the Question, I can state that inquiry into the Civil Services is now taking place in India, which embraces all the matters to which the hon. Member refers.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT, 1885—EXPENSES OF PREPARING LISTS — PAYMENT OF OFFICIALS — MOUNTBELLEW UNION.

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has received a copy of the following resolution:—

> "3rd September 1886.
>
> "Resolved, That we, the Board of Guardians of Mount Bellew Union, respectfully request the present Parliament to grant a similar amount of money as the former Parliament did for to recoup the clerk and rate collectors of this and the other Unions of Ireland for their services this year in compiling the Parliamentary Voters' Lists;"

and, if so, will the Government consent to the request which it contains?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the resolution referred to by the hon. Member had been received; and he had already stated to the House that it was not the intention of the Government to interfere with the Vote this year.

SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE — CONTEMPLATED PARTITION.

Mr. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Her Majesty's Government are in possession of any information corroborative of the telegram from Berlin in *The Standard* newspaper of 6th September, as to the contemplated partition of South Eastern Europe by the Triple Alliance; if the occupation of Bulgaria by Russian troops, or the administration of that Principality by a Russian governor, would be in accordance with existing Treaties or consistent with the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and the safety of Constantinople; and, if, in the absence of Sir Edward Thornton, it is proposed to recommit the representation of British interests at the Sublime Porte to Sir William White?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government are in possession of no such information as is mentioned in the first Question. The second suggests an hypothesis of separate action on the part of one of the Powers which Her Majesty's Government could not assume as probable. In the absence of Sir Edward Thornton the British Embassy at Constantinople is in charge of Mr. Fane, the Secretary.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)—LOANS TO FISHERMEN IN CROFTING PARISHES.

Mr. ANGUS SUTHERLAND (Sutherland) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether arrangements have been completed for carrying out the provisions of section thirty-two of 49 and 50 Vic. c. 29, in regard to loans to fishermen in crofting parishes in the Highlands of Scotland; and, if not, whether he can state when such arrangements are likely to be completed?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): Sir, an Order in Council will be required to bring into operation the Sea Fishing Boats (Scotland) Act, 1886, which Act must be read along with the Crofters Act referred to by the hon. Member, and the terms of that Order are at present under consideration.

NORTHERN PACIFIC—OCCUPATION OF PORT HAMILTON.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Port Hamilton is to be abandoned; whether it was seized and the British ensign hoisted eighteen months ago; and, what are the reasons advanced for its being abandoned?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): No decision has been taken to abandon Port Hamilton. It has been occupied by Her Majesty's Naval Forces since May 12, 1885.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—DRAINAGE OF LOUGH ERNE.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he has yet obtained the necessary information to enable him to state the intention of the Government as to referring the matter of the drainage of Lough Erne, with its tributaries, and the Ulster and Ballinamore Canals, to the proposed Commission on Irish Resources, having regard to the fact that the interests of a large district of the North West of Ireland, including the counties of Cavan, Monaghan, Fermanagh, Leitrim, and Donegal, are affected thereby?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.), in reply, said, he was informed that the terms of the Reference had not yet been settled; and, therefore, he was not able to give any information on the subject to the hon. Gentleman.

PRISONS (IRELAND) — RE-ORGANIZATION—INCREASE OF SALARIES OF OFFICIALS.

MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Government intend to carry out a recommendation of the Royal Commission on Prisons, by increasing the salaries of the officers, now that the re-organisation of staffs and the amalgamation of prisons have taken place?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Some time ago the Irish Government made recommendations for the increase of the salary of prison officers to the Treasury. Their Lordships required some further information, which has now been supplied to them, and it is hoped that the question will soon be settled.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—IRISH-SPEAKING DISTRICTS.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossory) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that the population in Irish-speaking districts who do not speak, or who are most imperfectly acquainted with, English, amounts to about one-fifth of the nation; whether he is aware that pupils in National Schools are not allowed to be taught Irish during school hours; whether result fees are only paid for pupils of the Fifth and Sixth Classes, while very few pupils remain at school long enough to attend these classes; whether Inspectors without a knowledge of Irish are appointed as Examiners in Irish-speaking districts; and, whether he will use his influence to secure that the Irish language may have as good a chance of preservation as the Welsh?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The hon. Member will, perhaps, allow me to refer him to an important Paper which was laid on the Table of the House in 1884 (No. 81 of the first Session of that year), and which shows, I think, among other things, that he is mistaken as to the proportion of the population who can properly be called Irish-speaking. I may say, however that the Commissioners of National Education give greater encouragement to the study of Irish than the Education Department here do to the study of Welsh; and they are persuaded that in this matter they have reached a limit beyond which it would not be advisable to go. The Commissioners state that they find no difficulty in conducting the examinations by thoroughly competent persons whenever classes are formed.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked, if, between this and the time when the Irish Education Vote was brought in, the right hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of extending to Ireland or adopting in Ireland provisions analogous to those in the Scotch Education Code with regard to the Gaelic-speaking population?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he would endeavour to do so.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked, if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the allegations of the Commissioners had been contested in a paper published by the Gaelic Union?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Very possibly.

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether one of the principal allegations made on behalf of the Civil

Service Writers is that they are employed on superior duties contrary to regulation, and whether the Departmental Committee appointed to consider their claims gave notice to the heads of the respective Departments of the time when they proposed to pay their visits; whether the Committee only inspected the work done by a few writers in each Department; and, if so, upon what principle the selections were made; and, whether an opportunity will be given to some members of the Writers' Class personally to represent their grievances to the Financial Secretary to the Treasury?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I do not think it necessary or desirable to enter on detailed answers as to the action taken by the Departmental Committee; but it may be sufficient answer to the hon. Member if I say that the Committee in question asked two or three of their number to inspect samples of the higher class work done by writers in different departments. This was done; but the visit was not intended to be in any general sense a visit of inspection of the writers. I am awaiting the Report of the Committee, and when I have received it I will decide what further steps are desirable.

THE CURRENCY—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—NAMES OF MEMBERS.

MR. PULESTON (Devonport): May I ask the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can now conveniently give to the House the names of the Members of the Currency Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Yes, Sir. The following Gentlemen have consented to serve on the Currency Commission:—The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P. (Secretary for Scotland) (Chairman), the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., Mr. Leonard Courtney, M.P., Mr. Lionel Cohen, M.P., Mr. W. H. Houldsworth, M.P., Sir John Lubbock, M.P., Mr. D. M. Barbour (Secretary to the Government of India Department of Finance and Commerce), Mr. John W. Birch (Director of the Bank of England), Sir Thomas H. Farrer, the Hon. W. Fremantle, C.B. (Deputy Master of the Mint), and Mr. J. R. Bullen Smith, C.S.I. (Member of the Council of India).

ARMY—REGIMENTAL BANDS AT POLITICAL MEETINGS AND PUBLIC FESTIVALS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he had seen a placard which had been circulated, setting forth that a Primrose League meeting would be held at Langworth, on the 9th of September, at which it was announced that a band of the Bedfordshire Regiment would be in attendance during the day; and whether the right hon. Gentleman would take steps to see that the Regulations in reference to military bands were carried out?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I have not seen the placard referred to, nor has the hon. Gentleman communicated it to me; but I shall certainly take care that the Regulations are complied with.

RAILWAYS—RAILWAY BOOKSTALLS—BOYCOTTING OF MR. GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET.

MR. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he could answer the Question of which he had given him private Notice. It was, Whether it was a fact that the recent pamphlet written by the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister was boycotted by all the railway bookstalls, which were said to be under the control of Messrs. W. H. Smith and Sons.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I must ask the hon. Member to give Notice of this Question. I have not read the private Notice.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I wish, Sir, to put a Question to you upon a point of Order. To-day being a Tuesday, according to the Standing Orders of the House—

> "Notices of Motions take precedence of Orders of the Day on Tuesdays, unless the House shall have otherwise directed."

The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day—I think on the 31st of last month—moved a Resolution—

> "That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motion on every day on which they may be appointed."

That, Sir, will justify the putting down of the Committee of Supply as the first Order of the Day upon the present Tuesday. But there is a second Order of the Day put down—namely, "Supply, Report"—which I beg to submit is not covered by the Resolution in question. The Question, therefore, which I wish to put to you is, that Notices of Motion which stand upon the Paper in the names of my hon. Friends the Members for Bethnal Green (Mr. Pickersgill) and West Cork (Mr. Gilhooly) have, by right, precedence over the second Order on the Paper—namely, the Report of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the Report of Supply is part of the same transaction as Committee of Supply, and is, therefore, covered by the Resolution which was passed by the House the other day.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: It is put down as a separate Order of the Day, Sir, and it is not included in the terms of the Resolution to which I have referred.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, it is covered by the Resolution moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day, and accepted by the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £1,369,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores for Land and Sea Service (including Establishments of Manufacturing Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

MR. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) what steps Her Majesty's Government propose to take with regard to the charges which have been made against the Ordnance Department, and which are familiarly known as the Ordnance scandals? For some time past the Press has teemed with accusations against gentlemen, highly connected, in the Ordnance Department, and the accusations themselves amount to this—that gentlemen who hold important positions in that Department have been in the habit of receiving commissions and fees from those who supply warlike material to the Government. Now, Sir, I know nothing personally as to the truth of these charges, nor do I know anything of those who have made them, and I deal with them simply in the interests of the public. There have been made, in the newspapers, charges which are charges of dishonour of the worst character that could possibly be made against high officials connected with any Government Department. The charges are preferred with such directness that one is inclined to think there may be something in them. I go no further than that; but of my own knowledge, in connection with another Department of the State, I know that commissions have been taken. In one instance which has been brought to my knowledge, one of the longest established, most respectable, and best houses in the City had been in the habit of supplying goods to a public Department, and because the firm declined to pay a commission it had been refused any further contracts from that Government Department. More than that. One gentleman connected with the Department, who appeared to take a leading part in the matter, gave a member of the firm a hint that such was the case, and even allowed him to see, lying on the table, a contract for goods which he had also offered to supply. The contract itself was for a larger sum than his own tender for the same goods, although the firm in question have certainly produced the very best articles. I do not mention the Department, because I have not permission to do so from the gentleman who supplied me with information. Although the articles produced by this firm are better than those which are being actually supplied, a larger and higher priced contract has been entered into, simply and solely on account of the refusal of this gentleman to give a commission. I drew attention to this case two years ago; it had no connection with the Ordnance Department, but referred altogether to another Department. Since then I have had several statements made to me—at least, three or four—and I am bound to say that the evidence, in the majority of them, is so strong that it is impossible for me to disbelieve it. With regard to the Ordnance Department, let me ask what has been the character of the warlike goods that have been supplied? We all know perfectly well that the bayonets which have been served out to the Army are of the very worst character, and that they are of no use for warlike purposes. In the Egyptian Campaign hon. Members will be aware that what are known as "jamming cartridges" were served out, and I believe that the same description of cartridge is still being supplied. I am able to speak of a matter which came under my own knowledge. I have served in the French Army, and at one time we were served out with cartridges which went by the name of "jam" cartridges, and I know the effect on the men when they arrived at the conclusion that they were unable to rely upon the ammunition and weapons with which they had been supplied for fighting purposes. Even when they were provided with cartridges that would not jam they would not fight. The same thing must take place in our own Army; and there is the strongest evidence that warlike material of the very worst and most useless character has, for a long time past, been served out to the Army. Another case was brought forward by my hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), in the discussion of the Estimates two or three years ago, and a somewhat similar charge was made. It was received, however, with nothing beyond an ordinary pigeon hole reply, to the effect that such a thing was an impossibility. Nevertheless, an examination into the facts of the case was forced upon the Government, and the result was that three of the heads of the Department were dismissed, and several others were reduced. I cannot speak with any certainty in regard to the charges which are now made; but I think it is sufficient for us to know that such allegations have been publicly made in the Press, and that they have now been continued for a long time past. Therefore, whether they be true or untrue, for the honour of the Service and for the dignity of the right hon. Gentleman himself and of his Predecessors in Office, it has become absolutely necessary that a thorough inquiry should take place. I read in one of the papers a day or two ago that some of the charges had been referred to the Law Officers of the Crown, and that the Law Officers have expressed an opinion that the charges have not been substantiated. But what evidence was taken? If, on taking evidence, the individuals against whom the charges are made should be found guilty of these dishonourable practices, they ought to be dismissed at once from Her Majesty's Service. If, on the other hand, the charges are untrue, the gentlemen now suffering from them should be fully acquitted. Similar charges were made some years ago against the Duke of York, who was accused by public report of selling commissions and making money out of it, not directly himself, but through his mistress. Although the Duke of York was a very high personage, it was deemed necessary that the charges should be inquired into; and when, upon examination, they were found to be true, the bold step was taken of dismissing the Duke of York from the position he held in the Army. That is a good precedent for the examination I now ask for. I am only repeating now the demand which is made by the public, and I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will do well for the honour of the Service, and for the dignity of his own position, to consent to this investigation, in order that the guilty may be convicted or the innocent acquitted. I have no desire to lend any authority whatever to the charges themselves, and I could not do so unless I had the most positive information. Therefore, I do not put the matter on the ground of evidence, but simply on the ground of the honour of the Services; and in consideration of the nature of the charges I think I am justified in asking the right hon. Gentleman what his intentions are?

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West): I think that never, during a discussion and debate of this kind, have I ever had to get up and address the Committee on a more important subject than the one which has just been brought under discussion by the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County (Mr. Molloy). I venture to think that it is a matter of the gravest importance, not only to the Army, but to the country. As far as I am able, I shall not say anything that will hurt the feelings, or give pain to any individual, nor have I any desire to place the accusations which have been made, however true or however false they may be, upon any particular parties or individuals. But, Sir, the country demands that there should be a thorough investigation into this grave and important question. The newspapers have written upon it; Questions have been asked in reference to it in this House; and statements have been made which may be false, or may be correct, or may be correct in part. I shall have a word or two to say on that point presently; but the question itself opens up the subject of our defences, not only at home, but all over the world. I refer to a question which is not only occupying the attention of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War, but which must also have occupied most closely the attention of my right hon. Friend the Member for Stirling (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) — namely, the great question of the coaling stations all over the world, in which this country is so deeply interested. Looking at our stations abroad, and the Reports we have received from General Officers and others who are thoroughly conversant with those stations, they show that in some cases fortifications have been made, but have been left without guns; while in other cases guns have been sent out, and there are no carriages on which to mount them. Let me take a station which is not very far distant—namely, Malta, in the Mediterranean. I would like to ask my right hon. Friend in what condition the defences of Malta are at the present moment? I am not going further into this subject now; but I think that, in the statement which we shall have presently from my right hon. Friend, we ought to be supplied with some information in regard to the coaling stations, which everyone knows are of the greatest and most vital importance to the nation in the event of war. Well, Sir, there is another question I should like to raise at the outset of this discussion, a question which was touched upon by the hon. Gentleman opposite the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) yesterday, on the Vote for the Commissariat and Transport Services. I wish to know whether or not we are to have a thorough investigation as to the quantity of stores which are required for absolute use, and that the country shall know whether one Government lets down these stores while another Government has to raise them up at unnecessarily high prices? Of course, a certain amount of odium is always attached to a Government which is compelled to ask for money for the purpose of providing additional stores after they have been let down by a preceding Government for purposes of their own. I am not accusing one Government more than another; but I think we ought to know what quantity of stores we really require, and, having ascertained that, the requirements ought to be kept up to the mark, and we should be able to see at a glance whether we have those stores in hand which are absolutely necessary for the requirements of the Service. It has been said that, if we were to have a statement of that kind, it would give foreigners information as to what we have in hand. But, Sir, there is no country like this for telling foreigners, by means of reporters and newspapers, and Questions in this House, everything we have. We have never been in the habit of hiding what we have got. What foreigners, however, are anxious to know, and what they can easily find out, is the number of men we can place in the field, and the number of ships we can send to sea. It is of very little consequence to them to know how many stand of arms we have in store, what quantity of gunpowder we possess, and how many transport and commissariat conveyances we have on our hands. Those are matters, however, which we ought to know; and, looking broadly at the question which has been brought forward by the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, I would venture to say that it divides itself into four different considerations. The first consideration is the accusations which have been made, and, in my humble opinion, not very fairly, against certain officers who have endeavoured, at any rate, to do their duty. Until I find that these accusations have been proved against any one of these men, I, for one, will not believe that any officer in the British Army can have committed the acts which have been alleged against these gentlemen. At the same time, I must say this—that the accusations having been made, it is the bounden duty of my right hon. Friend to provide some proper tribunal by whom they may be thoroughly sifted, so that men who have been foully aspersed may have an opportunity of clearing their characters, and so that those who have made the accusations—at present I am unable to say whether they are true or false—may, if the charges prove to be false, receive the punishment they richly deserve. That is the first consideration. The next question we have to consider is, whether the Committees we have at Woolwich, at the War Office, the Ordnance Committee, and the Elswick Committee are constituted in the best manner for the interests of the Service. That is a question which deserves very serious consideration. It must be borne in mind that these accusations have been made. The country is certainly not satisfied with many things which have taken place, and I am quite sure this House will be prepared to give every assistance in its power to my right hon. Friend and the Government in making a searching inquiry, with a view of ascertaining whether the way in which these Committees are organized is the best. The next point is, whether we have got the best arms that can be provided. That is a question which, in my humble judgment, deserves serious consideration; and the fourth question is one which is of the most vital importance to the Service. It is one upon which a Committee was asked for, some time ago, by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). That Committee was appointed, and it was presided over by Lord Stanley of Preston, then Colonel Stanley; but at present that Committee has only reported the evidence which it took, and I should have been glad to see it re-appointed; but that has not been found possible, owing to circumstances that were not known at the time. If hon. Members will read the evidence taken by that Committee, the questions that were asked and the answers that were given, I think they will come to the conclusion that something more requires to be done in regard to our contracts than is done at the present moment. The large contracts which are made whenever we go into a small or great war are very inefficiently carried out. Whenever an emergency arises we inevitably find that we have got nothing that we require in store, and we are obliged to enter into large contracts at the last moment. We saw how those contracts turned out in the recent campaigns in Egypt and in the Soudan. The evidence given before the Committee in reference to the stores that were sent out for the use of the troops in those campaigns speaks volumes; and I am certain that every hon. Member, no matter in what quarter of the House he sits, must be most anxious that a thorough investigation should take place. These are the four main questions which I think it is the bounden duty of my right hon. Friend to consider. With regard to the first question, I think that it ought not to be delayed. In the interests of the officers themselves it ought to be brought to proof at once; and if there is no foundation for the accusations which have been made, there ought to be an authoritative statement by the Secretary of State for War that the allegations are not proved. In reference to the second question, I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman himself is quite satisfied with the constitution of the Committees mentioned? I think that he himself must be of opinion that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, some outside Committee ought to be appointed, not connected in any way with the manufacture of ordnance. I hold that the Committee ought to be a judicial Committee, and not a constructive Committee at all. I have no doubt constructors may be actuated by the best intentions, and may be possessed of the highest ability; but still they are not men who are best fitted to judge of those interests which conduce to the making and the maintenance of a great country. We have had many serious accusations made in the newspapers. I am not going into the whole of those accusations; but I wish to state three of them, because I think they are such as deserve immediate consideration, not only by this Committee of Supply, but by my right hon. Friend. The first I will mention is this—it is admitted, I believe, to be true that Reports have been sent by General Officers and by officers commanding regiments in the face of the enemy with regard to the character of the arms which have been served out to the troops. We should like to know simply what those Reports were. My right hon. Friend has said that it would not be wise or prudent to let the public know what these Reports were, because it might prevent officers from stating hereafter what is the character of the weapons supplied to them. He said that they would not like to send Reports, and that they would naturally refuse or decline to state accurately the character of the weapons served out to them. I do not myself credit that for one moment. I can quite understand that if there was to be a black mark put against their names for any disagreeable statement they might make there might be some hesitation on their part; but I am perfectly certain that that will never be the case so long as we have at the head of the Department men like my two right hon. Friends—the late Secretary of State for War and the present one—whose only object is to secure that the very best weapons shall be issued to the Army. If you encourage officers—both General Officers and officers commanding regiments—to state what the defects are of the class of weapon served out to them, I think you would do good service. I consider that the first duty of an officer in command is to see that his men are properly and well equipped, certainly in regard to their arms; and to say that they would not dare to make a truthful Report is, I believe, to treat them with great injustice. Hon. Members of this House would very much like to see the Reports which have been sent to the Government, because those Reports will show whether the allegations which have been made in regard to this question as to the character of the arms issued are true or false. The next question that has been raised has reference to the Nordenfelt gun. I would like to ask my right hon. Friend whether he thinks it a wise or prudent course to allow the barrels of those guns to be manufactured at Woolwich, when the contract is made with Mr. Nordenfelt for the remaining portion of them. I think that the price is £376, out of which the cost of the barrel made at Woolwich is £139 19*s.* 5*d.* If Mr. Nordenfelt is able to make the gun, why is he not employed to make the whole of it? Why should Woolwich make any portion of it? I would further like to know whether the Committee at Woolwich, who are the persons who would have to pass these guns, are a proper Committee to be intrusted with that duty, a considerable portion of the guns having been made by themselves? That is a second allegation which has been brought before the Secretary of State. There is, however, a third question, which was raised, I believe by the hon. and gallant Member for South-East Essex (Major Rasch)—namely, the question of saddles. It appears that nearly 3,000 saddles were withdrawn after having been issued. Now, I should like to know, because it is a most important question, who passed those saddles for the Service if they were unfit for use? I think the House is entitled to know who was the man who passed them, so that the matter should be brought home to someone. What we want to know is, who it was who passed saddles that must have been known to be unfit for service? These things did not happen so much in olden times, although, undoubtedly, they did happen occasionally. All I can say is that when we find these things do happen it is our duty to institute a thorough inquiry, in order to find out who was the individual who passed articles that were palpably unfit for use. Well, Sir, there is another question. I do not propose to enter at length into the question of guns; but I will leave that to hon. Members who are more thoroughly acquainted with that matter. All I wish to say about the guns is this — we never learnt the lesson which foreign nations learnt, and which we ought to have learnt long ago — namely, the necessity of supplying ourselves with breech-loading guns much earlier than we did. I am unable—at any rate I do not wish—to say who was responsible for the neglect; but, nevertheless, it is a fact that for many years we did nothing but make the old-fashioned muzzle-loading gun, and made no attempt to supply ourselves with breech-loading guns, although they were being manufactured in large quantities on the Continent. Also, as to the use of steel in the manufacture of guns, we were long in learning the lesson which the experience of foreign nations ought to have taught us. We preferred other methods, and some of them are still in use at Woolwich. I do not say whether the authorities are right or wrong; but there are many persons who urge that we ought to be much more forward with regard to our steel guns than we are at the present moment. Surely it is a question which deserves serious consideration. We ought to know why we are not in a much more forward state than we are now. There is another question which is somewhat pressing at the present moment—namely, the question of a new rifle. That, I believe, is a question which rests with another Committee. In answer to a Question which I put to my right hon. Friend the other day, I was informed that a new Committee had been appointed to inquire most carefully into the new rifle. One Committee did make an inquiry; but it was dismissed without reporting. I have been informed by a gentleman who had a great deal to do with the matter, but whose name it is not necessary I should mention to-night, that there were differences of opinion among the Members of the Committee owing to certain alterations which had been made in the rifle by one of their own body in opposition to the opinion of the majority. Although the Committee did not approve of those alterations, they were approved of by the Department, and were made; and the Committee, after having sat for something like six years, were abruptly discharged, without having made a Report. Now, I believe that that was a most excellent Committee, and that, taking it as a whole, they worked hard, and did well. Unfortunately, they received no thanks for their services, nor that encouragement which men are entitled to who give up a large amount of their time in an endeavour to do service to the country. I only mention this matter in order to show that an inquiry into the whole system ought to be undertaken. I am not going to enter into the recriminations which may have passed between one gentleman and another; but I think I am entitled to say this—that having regard to the wealth and position of this country, looking at our productiveness in regard to the appliances of war in days gone by, we ought still to stand at the head of the manufacture of arms. Then, the question is—Have we gone behind, or have we not? Are we in the position we ought to occupy? Have we such gun manufacturers as could be obtained if they had a fair chance of competing with Woolwich, Elswick, and other places? Are we not restricting competition by giving out that we do not want the arms which other people can produce, and that we are perfectly satisfied with those our Government manufactories produce? There can be no doubt that we are bound as a nation to have the best weapons that can be found, and at the present moment the country believes we have not got the best weapons. Therefore a fair and thorough and searching inquiry ought to be made. I am satisfied that if my right hon. Friend consents to give the inquiry which we ask for, he will make it one of a most exhaustive character, so that we may ascertain whether we have those weapons which a great nation like this ought to possess; and, if not, steps ought at once to be taken to place us in a more satisfactory position. I maintain that it is the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government to place our Army and Navy in a position as effective as that of any other nation in the world.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I will not detain the Committee for many minutes, and I only rise because at one period of my life I was a private soldier; and as I am consequently acquainted with their wants I have been asked by some private soldiers to submit certain facts to the Committee, which I believe to have been substantiated by evidence. They allege that when they were fighting for their country in Egypt they were left on more than one occasion without food and without medicine, because the transport was unfit to convey the stores. On two occasions I am informed that the harness or saddlery was so thoroughly rotten that when attached to the transport cart it broke down under the weight, and the medicine chests were left behind, because it was impossible to take them further. On one particular occasion two days' rations, required for troops on the march, were abandoned owing to the transport proving entirely insufficient. I have gone carefully through the evidence given before the inquiry which has already been referred to by the hon. and gallant Member for North-West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot); but I will only trouble the Committee with the answers to three questions. I find from the evidence of Assistant Commissary General Reeves—Question 2,166—with reference to the pack saddles, that they were supplied by Woolwich Arsenal, but were badly put together. In answer to Question 2,169, the same officer stated that one cart had to be abandoned by the regimental transport on account of the constant breaking of the harness. The witness added that the harness was very poor stuff, and must have been in store for many years. Then, whose business was it to see that the harness was in proper condition? In this case it seems to have been in store for some time, and to have deteriorated while in store. The witness was asked—Question 2,614—"Do you know what was the reason of two days' rations being lost?" He explained that it was upon an occasion when an expeditionary force had been sent out which was intended to be away for two days, and it was sent out with provisions for two days. But the men composing the expeditionary force returned without having been able to do what they were sent out to do, because they found themselves compelled to abandon the provisions, owing to the regimental transport having completely broken down. Now, I submit to the Committee that when enormous sums of money are voted year after year by Parliament for the service of the country the least that the country can expect is that the pack saddles shall not be useless, the carts imperfect, and the harness rotten. I will not trouble the Committee with a speech, because these facts seem to me far more eloquent than anything which I can say.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I ask for the indulgence of the Committee while I, as a Naval Member, offer some observations on this important Vote. Perhaps no apology is necessary when attention is drawn to the Vote, which at page 53 informs us that we are asked practically to vote £1,250,000 for the sea service of the country. It is mainly on that Vote, as far as the sea service is concerned, that I desire to offer a few remarks to the Committee. It is refreshing to be able to speak freely and altogether apart from all Party feeling. I am glad to find that there are occasions when both sides of the House can come together and discuss calmly the armaments of the country, and what is necessary for the maintenance of the power of the country. Let me remind the Committee that a short time ago—as recently as last May—there was a great scare as to the quality of the guns in the Navy. It was brought to our notice by the bursting of a gun on board the *Collingwood;* and it is mainly with the inquiry which took place into the cause of that accident, and the Report of the Committee upon our naval armaments generally, that I wish now to occupy the attention of the Committee. The alarm which was raised as to the quality of the guns in the Navy was certainly not without foundation. I hold in my hand a Report of the Ordnance Committee appointed by the late Secretary of State for War to inquire into the bursting of that gun. To that Committee were attached certain special Members, called "Associated Members," and consisting of Sir William Armstrong, Sir Frederick Abel (Chemist of the War Department), Colonel Maitland (Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factory), Captain Noble, and Mr. Gledhill. I find no fault with the composition of the major part of the Committee, nor with the fact that Members were specially appointed to act with it, with this exception—I do find fault with a serious error of omission. Surely the bursting of a naval gun while experiments were being made by a captain in the Royal Navy ought to have suggested that the naval element should have received better representation on the Committee. Colonel Maitland, the Superintendent of the Gun Factory—the Department which made the gun—was placed upon the Committee, but not a single naval officer who had been concerned in trying the gun. I have no doubt that the Naval Members of this House will concur with me in the opinion that as gentlemen representing the War and Ordnance Departments were on the Committee, there should also have been appointed, at least, the captain of the ship, or Captain Fisher, of the *Excellent*, a naval officer who has had very large experience in connection with the working of heavy guns. Both of these officers are very able men, and stand high in the Service. There is one remark which I desire to make on this part of the subject. The bursting of the *Collingwood* gun cast no imputation whatever upon the naval branch of the Service. Naval officers are not, in the slightest degree, responsible for the guns supplied to them. The Ordnance Department are entirely responsible for that, and it is upon their action and their shortcomings that I wish to dwell. The Report of the Committee is a very important Report; and after reading it carefully I say, advisedly, that upon that Report the Manufacturing Department at Woolwich stand condemned. In order that I may make my case clear it is necessary that I should trespass for a short time on the patience of the Committee, because it is of no use to complain without suggesting a remedy, and by-and-bye it will be my duty humbly to suggest a remedy. The Committee had a variety of questions referred to them by a special Order. They were told by the Order of Reference, which will be found in Appendix II. attached to the Report, to inquire—(a) into the cause of the accident; (b) the steps to be taken to prevent such an occurrence with the remaining guns of similar pattern (14 in all I believe); and (c) whether, looking to the discussions and correspondence which took place with regard to the designs of Marks I. and II. guns before they were finally approved, and to subsequent experience, there was any reason to doubt their being of sufficient strength, especially at the breach, to stand the charge which had been approved? A copy of a Minute by the Director of Naval Ordnance, dated May 14, 1886, was also forwarded through the First Lord of the Admiralty, and they were asked to inquire—(d) whether, in view of the accident, they would consider it expedient to review the recommendation in the Report above mentioned, touching guns other than the 12-inch? In reference to the second head of the inquiry, the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty intimated that chase-hooping would be desirable, and stated that the Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factory had been directed to submit designs. Although Captain Fisher, of the *Excellent*, was not placed upon the Committee, he was examined as a witness, together with Captain Noble, who was a Member of the Committee. By excluding the Captain of the *Excellent* the authorities undoubtedly excluded one of the most competent men who could have been placed on the Committee. The Committee arrived at the following conclusions:—In the first place, that—

> "The metal in the chase of 12-inch B.L. gun, Mark II., No. 16, was, as shown by the mechanical tests and chemical examination, irregular in its character; such metal would be specially liable to the setting up of internal strains during the processes of forging, or of oil hardening."

Next they say—

> "The metal had not been subjected to annealing processes by which such strains would have been mitigated, annealing not having been adopted until a date subsequent to the manufacture of this gun."

Most of us who take an interest in the manufacture of guns, shot, and shell had heard of the annealing process long before this disaster. Then the Committee say—

> "The gun had been, before issue, fired with large charges (340 lbs. C.) of a slow-burning powder, the effect of which would be to subject the chase to a severe stress."

Fourthly, they say—

> "After the preliminary trial and proof had been carried out, the gun was not fired for 18 months. The fracture of the chase occurred on firing the first round after this period, the charge used being a reduced one of 221¼ lbs. Prism I., brown."

They leave us to draw the conclusion that as the gun had been neglected and not used for 18 months it might have been considered to be all right, and they seem to think that this was the reason of the failure of the gun. It is well known, they say, that steel and iron deteriorates after intervals of time, from not being used, and that they sometimes break without the application of external force from the effects of internal strains. That may be so; I am not metallurgist enough to justify me in expressing a contrary opinion. Then they say, in their last conclusion—

> "The chase burst with violence when firing a charge which subjected it to comparatively low pressure, after having previously sustained a series of high pressures."

Therefore, they admit that the gun ought not to have burst. Then they go on to give their opinion, and they say—

> "Taking the above into consideration, the Committee are of opinion that the fracture of

> the chase of No. 16 gun, when fired with three-quarters of the Service full charge of powder, was due to a combination of the following causes:—To a want of uniformity in the metal of which the chase was composed."

That rather suggests that the Ordnance Committee itself was badly composed, and that it ought to have had some eminent chemist upon it. They go on to say—

> "To the absence of annealing after forging and oil hardening, which treatment would have mitigated any internal strains set up in these processes. That such strains were probably intensified by the preliminary and proof rounds, and their effect was developed during the interval of time between proof and the accident. To the foregoing unfavourable conditions not having been counteracted by the hooping of the chase."

I submit that they stand condemned by their own Report. The Secretary of State asks—and the words are printed in the Report in italics—

> "Is there any reason to doubt their being of sufficient strength, especially at the breech, to stand the charge which has been approved?"

They recommend—

> "That the chase of these guns should be strengthened by hooping them to the muzzle after removing the front coil 3 B."

With regard to the other point, they recommend—

> "That these guns should be lined in the chamber to a diameter of 14¾ inches, and that after this operation the guns be proved with two charges, each of Prism I., brown powder, to give not less than 17 tons pressure per square inch in the chamber with a 714 lb. projectile; these two rounds to be followed with five rounds of such a charge as may be determined on for service; the pressure to be given by this charge not to exceed 15 tons per square inch in the chamber."

The Committee deal next with the question—

> "Whether, in view of the accident, they would consider it expedient to review the recommendations in the Report touching guns other than the 12 inch;"

and they say that—

> "having reviewed the recommendations made in Report No. 429, under heading III., they consider that no alteration is necessary in their recommendation therein made concerning certain breech-loading guns (which they specify), all of which are either hooped to the muzzle or have double tubes."

Passing on to the 9·2-inch Marks I. and II. guns, they say—

> "They have, since the date of Report No. 429, been hooped to the muzzle. The Committee consider that these guns should have their chambers lined to an 11-inch diameter. After this operation, the guns to be proved with two charges of Prism I. brown powder, to give not less than 17 tons pressure per square inch in the chamber with a 380 lb. projectile; these two rounds to be followed by five rounds of such a charge as may be determined on for service; the pressure to be given by this charge not to exceed 15 tons per square inch in the chamber."

I am sorry that I am compelled to trouble the Committee with so many details; but it is absolutely necessary to allude to them briefly. Passing on to the 8-inch breech-loading guns, they say that these guns which are manufactured at Woolwich—

> "Marks III. and IV. should be chase-hooped to the muzzle, if consistent with naval requirements."

Now, I think that is a point which we naval officers ought to understand. We ought to know something about naval requirements, and what I want is that the Committee should assist us in obtaining some control of the matter. The Committee say—

> "If consistent with naval requirements the chamber should be lengthened to enable the gun to fire the same charge as the 8-inch guns, Marks V. and VI. In these designs the trunnions have been moved forward, the weight slightly increased and the chamber lengthened 3½ inches. Also the 8-inch guns, Mark VII., be chase-hooped to the muzzle. In this design the gun is shortened 4 inches, and the weight slightly increased."

They then pass on to the 6-inch breech-loading guns, and they recommend that Marks II. and III. should be chase-hooped to the muzzle, and that Mark V. should before issue be chase-hooped to the muzzle, and further altered by having the tube hooked to the outside hoops. They further recommend that the 10—4-inch R. M. L. guns should be chase-hooped to the muzzle. Then, am I not justified in saying that the whole Manufacturing Department of Woolwich, as far as the naval guns are concerned, stands condemned by this Report of the Committee? If they recommend that all these alterations should be made in the guns, I can only say, God help us in the future! If our sailors and naval officers cannot trust the guns put on board the ships without having them chase-hooped, then our sailors are very much to be pitied, and I leave the Committee to draw their own conclusions. A more unsatisfactory state of things as far as the Gun Manufacturing Department is concerned could not exist, and I maintain that this unsatisfactory state of things is a disgrace to the country, possessed as it is of such enormous wealth, and such great mechanical and engineering talent. I quite agree with the hon. and gallant Member for North-West Sussex that much more ought to be done to encourage the large manufacturers of the country by affording them opportunities for competing in the manufacture of great guns. The present condition of things is strongly objected to. At the present moment we are limited to Woolwich, to Armstrong & Co., and Whitworth & Co. In suggesting a remedy for this state of affairs I not only express my own opinion, but that of others connected with the Navy, who agree with my views. Having been, for many years, a gunnery instructor myself, I have taken a great interest in all that concerns my own branch of the Service, and I have felt it a conscientious duty to obtrude myself upon the Committee in matters of such great national importance. What we want is that the Navy should have its fair share in the management of its own armaments. We design the ships, but we must not arm them. As a matter of fact, the Naval Authorities design the ships, build the ships, equip the ships, and fight the ships; but we are not allowed to arm them. We have a Director of Naval Ordnance, and I admit that his voice now-a-days is attended to; but until within the last two years we had no voice at all, and had no option but to accept what the Ordnance Department chose to give us. In former years the trade was much more open than now, and the guns were supplied by contractors like the Carron Company, who supplied us with carronades. We have not always been dependent on Woolwich. No doubt, it is proper, if we are to be in a proper state of defence, that we should not be altogether in the hands of private contractors; but I think the Naval Service should be permitted to go to the trade generally for the guns they require. We have no wish to increase the expense to the country by one farthing. All we say is—"Give us this Gun Vote, and make the Naval Lords responsible for the expenditure; let the Vote appear regularly in the Navy Estimates." We should then be able to go Woolwich and say—"We want so many guns of such a calibre—can you give them to us?" At present, the ships are kept waiting for guns time after time; that is a serious evil. If Woolwich cannot supply us, we should be free to go to Armstrong & Co., or Whitworth & Co., and say—"Can you supply us?" Possibly some other gun firm may start up. If so, all the better for the country; for we do not want to be dependent on one firm. Let me remind the Committee that we are far behind other nations in the matter of guns, both as regards the strength of the gun itself and its durability, and also in projectiles and powder. Both the Germans and the French possess better guns, projectiles, and powder than we do. Indeed, I am informed that our best powder for the large guns is obtained from abroad, because our manufacturers have not yet devised the best method of manufacturing powder as the Germans do. We contract for our ships, and I believe that we get good ships built for us; we contract for the engines, and we get admirable engines built for us. All the world comes to us for our engines. Why, then, in the name of common sense, should we not be allowed to contract for our guns? And now let me add a few words in conclusion. I trust that I have made out my case. The naval opinion of the country is alarmed at the bursting of these guns. I hope, however, that I have said enough to satisfy the Committee, from this very Report of the Ordnance Committee, to condemn the system pursued at Woolwich. I speak with the highest respect of the talented officers to be found at Woolwich Arsenal. Many of them are known to myself and to other Members of this House. It appears to me that we ought to have the best mechanical talent at our disposal that can possibly be obtained. It cannot be supposed that a Colonel of Artillery, at the head of a great Department like the Gun Factory, is necessarily a good metallurgist, or a good mechanic, and we ought to have the most talented man the country can produce at the head of that Department. Years ago you considered that requirement so essential, that Sir William Armstrong was employed to give the country the benefit of his great services and knowledge. If that step was taken then, I do not see why a similar step should not be taken now. At any rate, the confidence of the country has been shaken in the manufacture of these guns, the confidence of the Navy is entirely gone in some of them, and the Report of this Committee can only have the effect of inspiring the Service with a further want of confidence. There are 14 guns of a similar type to the one which burst on board of the *Collingwood*, and the Committee report that they ought to be strengthened. Naval men say—"We do not want these guns at all." I have the very best information behind me, and I know they say—"You may do what you like with these guns; sell them to the Turks, who, judging from the state of affairs in the East, may want them soon; but we do not require sham guns. Therefore, at any rate, put these 14 guns aside, and do not let us have them. Our confidence is shaken in them, and it is not to be expected that the men will have more confidence in them than their officers. The time was when a sailor was in the habit of patting these guns with great affection; but those times have gone." We have heard a great deal from distinguished authorities in this House about the obligations of duty and honour. I certainly think there is an obligation of duty and honour on the part of this House and of Parliament to see that the Navy have guns that they can fight with. If we have guns that the men can fight and the officers can control, you may rest satisfied that the honour of the country will be safe in their hands.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): I thank the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County (Mr. Molloy) for having opened this debate. I must admit that, in speaking as he did, he has done good service to the country. He commenced his remarks by referring to what is commonly known as the Ordnance scandal. I do not intend to make any observations on that particular part of the hon. Member's remarks. It is, of course, a serious subject to deal with; but I think it might very well be left in the hands of the Secretary of State for War, who will take the necessary steps to protect the honour of the British Empire. Any other matter that may arise out of the scandals must be left in the hands of those gentlemen who preside over our Law Courts. I desire to say a few words upon some other charges which have been brought forward by the public Press against the Ordnance Department—charges, not of personal corruption, but of failure. I think any hon. Member who has studied the Report upon the bursting of the gun of the *Collingwood*, which has already been quoted, cannot but admit that the responsibility for the failure rests with the Ordnance Department. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Eastbourne (Admiral Field) has quoted somewhat largely from that Report. I shall not follow in his footsteps, but I fully endorse what has been said—that the Report carries on the face of it a confession of failure. The Committee which sat to inquire into the bursting of the *Collingwood* gun reported, in the first place, that the cause of the bursting was the bad manufacture of steel; that the steel was not so good as it ought to have been; and, further, that it had not been submitted to the annealing process. That is not all. Some persons may be inclined to draw the conclusion from that Report that this is an exceptional case, and that it only occurred in reference to one particular gun, and that a similar failure is not likely to occur again—that it so happened that the steel furnished for this particular gun was defective, and that it may be assumed that the bursting of the gun was purely accidental. We have, however, a further Report from the Committee, that it is necessary to chase-hoop all the guns of a similar type, and guns also both larger and smaller in weight. That, I submit, really amounts to a confession that the system itself is wrong. It must be so, I think, because it is even necessary to change the whole nature of the gun, so to speak. The Committee have evidently no confidence that the system itself is right; and, therefore, they propose that a large amount of metal should be put round the gun, in order to make it safe. There are those who say that even that precaution will not make these new guns safe. Whether that be so or not I do not know; but I would like to say this—that the whole system wants overhauling, and unless we can get the guns to do the work expected of them, without adding to them an enormous weight of metal after they have been made, I think we had better go somewhere else for our guns. The reason, to my mind, why the system is at fault is because we have not got any independent authority to inquire into it. It is a system which has grown up within what has been often termed in the papers and elsewhere a "gun ring." I hardly like to use that word, because it may be thought offensive; but, at any rate, it is a system which has certainly grown up within a very close circle—I may call it a tripartite alliance between the War Office, Woolwich, and Elswick; and nothing that comes from without that circle is considered for one moment by the Ordnance Department. I may be told that this exclusiveness is to prevent the authorities from being bored by the nostrums of inventors. We hear a good deal of inventors. There was one who sat in this House for many years, who was known to many hon. Members—I allude to the late Sir William Palliser, a man who did great service to the country by his inventions, which were of a most valuable description. But those who knew him as well as I did know the difficulties he had to contend with at the Ordnance Department. They well know that he was perpetually being snubbed, and how, in fact, his life was worn away, and how in the end he died, simply and purely, from a broken heart. Let me take another instance—the inventions of Mr. Krupp. No one can look upon Mr. Krupp as a charlatan—his guns are used all over Europe. Whether they are the best guns that can be procured I do not know; but I do know that the firm, as gun makers, were badly treated, and snubbed by the Ordnance Authorities. I have a letter from the firm in my own possession which says that the offers made to the War Office were treated in the most cavalier manner. They offered to produce a gun at their own expense, to send it over here and to have it tested at Woolwich; but they stipulated that they and their men must have the working of the gun. Probably they had not that entire confidence in some of the Ordnance Authorities that some people have, and they knew that a gun could be made to tell any kind of tale very easily if it were not properly manipulated. The firm, therefore, stipulated that the experiments should be made by themselves, and that, although they were to be carried out under the eyes of the Ordnance Authorities, the inventors should have the manipulation of the gun. The War Office refused these terms, and the consequence was that the gun was not tried in this country. In connection with this question a gentleman, one of those obnoxious class of inventors, came to me the other day with an invention—I do not know whether it was a good one or a bad one, but I was rather struck by one thing that he said. He said that he had been to the War Office several times, and that at length they had got rid of him by saying—"The fact is, Mr. So-and-so, we cannot take your gun until it has been adopted by some other country." Now, I think that that is a most humiliating position for this country to occupy. My hon. and gallant Friend who last addressed the House said that the Navy is a Department which is most interested in this matter. As a matter of fact, quite one-half of the Votes for Ordnance is for the Naval Service. My hon. and gallant Friend asks how it was that on the occasion of the inquiry with reference to the bursting of the *Collingwood* gun there were not more naval officers on the Committee? I think my hon. and gallant Friend said there was no naval officer appointed at all.

ADMIRAL FIELD: No: I did not say that. I knew very well that there were three naval officers on the Committee—namely, the Vice President and two Post Captains. What I said was that the naval element was not properly represented.

CAPTAIN PRICE: There were gentlemen associated with the Ordnance Committee specially appointed to assist in the inquiry, and among those gentlemen there was not a single naval officer. Five Associate Members were appointed altogether, all of whom were more or less concerned or responsible for the making of these very guns. That is an important point, and my hon. and gallant Friend was right in asking how it was that the men at the head of the Naval Ordnance Department were not represented on the Committee. The Director of Naval Ordnance was not on the Committee, nor was Captain Fisher, who probably knows more about heavy guns than any other officer, either in or out of Woolwich. I am strongly of opinion that the Navy should provide their own guns, and that the guns should be placed on the Navy Estimates. I want to know why it is that we have not got a Board of Naval Ordnance? I shall be told that we have a Director of Naval Ordnance at the Admiralty; but I should like to know what authority and responsibility he possesses? We ought to have, in my opinion, a Board of Naval Ordnance consisting of a certain number of naval officers and associated with them certain civilians—experts, who are acquainted with the making of guns. This Board should have power to order guns where they please. They might order them from Woolwich if they chose. I do not want to do away with the Woolwich Factory, certainly not; but they should have power to say what kind of guns they want to do the particular work they require them for, and they should have the right to order such guns either from Woolwich or from outside Woolwich, wherever they please. They should also have money to spend in the trial of the guns; because if they do not have that power we may depend upon it we shall continue to go on in the cheese-paring way we have hitherto gone on. That, in my opinion, lies at the root of the whole matter. We do not spend money enough in testing the guns and making trials with them; and unless we do that we shall still be running in the same groove and having guns made without any of them being properly tested. I think the suggestion I have made is a feasible one, and I do not see why it should not be carried out. I do not want to set up a Naval Woolwich, nor do I desire to abolish Woolwich; but I wish to reform it, and I think we ought to have placed at the head of our Gun Factory not a soldier, but a civilian. Of course, if the soldier is the best man who can be obtained, let us have him; but let us have the best man, and do not make it a necessary qualification that he shall be a soldier. I am aware there is a prejudice against having a naval officer; but naval officers know more about naval guns than Artillery officers do. It is only those who have been specially trained in that particular branch of the Service who know anything about it. I should like to ask, in reference to these guns, what would be the cost of chase-hooping the guns? An hon. Member who spoke from below the Gangway has said that it is only 16 guns that require to be chase-hooped; but if I read the Report of the Committee aright, guns, both smaller and larger, will require it. I should like to know, first of all, what the total expense will be, and where it will be necessary to order the gun mountings, and what will be the cost of doing that? I should like to know whether, in the opinion of the naval officers who sat upon the Committee, or of the Director of the Naval Ordnance, these guns, after they have been chase-hooped and altered, will be of any use to the Navy without an alteration of the gun mountings? In talking about the alteration of the fittings on board ship, we must never forget that we must look upon our armaments as floating gun carriages themselves. They are nothing more or less than that. They are floating gun carriages on which these guns are to be placed, and very expensive gun carriages they are too. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) brought a question before the House not long ago in reference to the *Nile* and *Trafalgar;* two floating gun carriages which have cost £1,000,000 a-piece. The House voted against the hon. Member because they thought the conclusion he arrived at was wrong. But since the accident to the *Collingwood* gun I have been thinking seriously over the matter, and I am not quite sure that we shall be justified in going on with the building of the *Nile* and *Trafalgar*, unless we know they are to be armed with some gun we can rely upon. As the case now stands, we have no such gun. It must be borne in mind that the guns to be placed on board these vessels will be of a larger calibre than those on board the *Collingwood.* I should like to know where these guns are? I believe that one has been made, but that it has not been tried or tested in any way, so that there is in reality no gun in existence, and, so far as I can make out, no gun likely to be in existence for many years to come fit to be placed on board these ships. I have no desire to take up the time of the Committee longer; but the questions which have been raised are most important. I hope that my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War will give his attention to the matter, and that he will be able to do something to relieve us from a position of very deep humiliation, and remove a source of very great danger.

CAPTAIN SELWYN (Cambridge, Wisbech): I wish to make a remark in reference to a matter which has been alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member for North-West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot)—namely, the new issue of rifles. We who belong to the Army are given to understand that such new issue is contemplated, and we have seen the rifles which we are told it is proposed to issue. Now, on behalf of the taxpayers, and speaking in the interests of the Army, as far as I am allowed to do so, I hope that the question will receive much consideration, and that great care will be exercised before the new rifle is given to us. In the first place, the issue of a new arm to the Army will cause a very large expenditure; and not only that, but I believe that the rifle we have at present is in many ways superior to the one which it is proposed to substitute. I believe that the chief object aimed at in the new rifle is to provide a flatter trajectory, and that that trajectory has been obtained. Experiments are, I believe, being made in regard to the loading of the cartridges, with a view of altering the system of the Martini-Henry rifle we now have in the Army. There is another subject to which attention ought to be called. It is a matter which has often been spoken of; but very little has been done in regard to it—I refer to the jamming of the cartridges. It has been pointed out that the cartridges which are at present supplied for use with the Martini-Henri rifle do jam to a very great extent; and I believe it arises, to a certain extent, from the way in which the cartridge is manufactured. If our cartridges were made as those of other nations, which are almost universally constructed of solid drawn brass, I believe that the jamming would, to a great extent, be prevented. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will be able to tell us whether it has been determined to issue these new rifles, and whether experiments are going to be made with regard to the loading of the present cartridges, to see whether better results cannot be obtained in future from the cartridges than are obtained at present. I believe, for instance, that the makers of machine-guns, such as the Nordenfelt gun, have obtained greater penetration by loading cartridges in a different manner, such, for instance, as using different sorts of powder; one of coarser and another of finer grain. What I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman is that instead of trying experiments with the new rifle, and before committing the country to the serious expenditure which the issue of new rifles would involve, some attempt should be made to improve the cartridges, with the view of obtaining better results.

Mr. WOODALL (Hanley): In commencing, I desire to express my full sense of the extreme gravity of the subject now before the Committee, and the great advantages which must be derived by the Public Service from a thorough discussion of this question, and of other topics which are now engaging the public attention. In the first place, allow me to say a word in answer to the question of the hon. and gallant Member for Wisbech (Captain Selwyn) as to the new rifle. That is a subject which has engaged the attention of the authorities for a considerable time past. The matter has been under the consideration of a special Committee of experts, and their Report was finally adopted by right hon. Gentlemen opposite when last in Office. The new arm was then adopted, and it is now in process of manufacture. I think the hon. and gallant Gentleman is quite right in suggesting that great care and caution should be exercised before the new arm is brought into operation. With that view 1,000 rifles have already been produced and distributed throughout the country; and I have no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will very shortly be in possession of a Report as to the experience which has been gained in connection with the use of that arm. A certain number of the new rifles were sent to Wimbledon the other day, and I believe the opportunity of trying them was warmly appreciated by the skilled Volunteers who used them. The hon. and gallant Gentleman has also referred to the jamming of cartridges; and I think he will be gratified to learn that solid drawn cartridges are being supplied without unnecessary delay. As to the Ordnance Department, the several speakers who have engaged the attention of the Committee to-night have given expression to their apprehensions that there may be a good deal of truth in the extremely uncomfortable suggestions which have been made by writers in the newspapers and elsewhere for some time past. The Department has been charged formally with conspiracy, corruption, corrupt favouritism, and malversation, and the same charges have been made against other Departments in the State. It is certainly very unpleasant to read these things. We have been told that our heavy guns are in a deplorable condition; that bad cartridges have been served out to the Army; that bad bayonets have been placed in the hands of the troops; and that the swords supplied are unfit for use. I have already referred to the cartridges. It is undoubtedly true that there were cases in which the cartridges jammed in Egypt; but it is only fair to the Ordnance Department to say that no such failures had been experienced in previous campaigns, and that, owing to some misadventure, no Reports reached the responsible authorities here from the officers commanding the troops. Immediately the matter was brought to the notice of the authorities in Pall Mal an inquiry was instituted, remedial measures were devised, and, as quickly as possible, solid case cartridges were substituted. A considerable quantity of them were sent out to Egypt, and I believe they were actually used in one of the battles there. They have been further reported on in connection with the experience gained in Egypt; and at the present moment, although the old form of cartridge is still supplied for certain purposes, wherever the Army is sent on active service it is supplied exclusively with solid drawn cartridges. With regard to the bayonets of which we have heard so much, the fact is that from the experience of Egypt we also learned, for the first time, that some portion of the bayonets were untrustworthy; but even with regard to these it was reported by one Commanding Officer that he found no fault with the Martini-Henri bayonet, but that he preferred to have it rather too soft than too hard. The officer commanding the first battalion of the Black Watch made no complaint against the bayonets, although his regiment had been very hotly engaged. The Commanding Officer of the first battalion of the Gordon Highlanders reported that the bayonets were good in quality and effective for use. These opinions were expressed in reply to a request made by the authorities for information. It it also true that the first battalion of the York and Lancaster Regiment and the Royal Irish Fusiliers, when they returned home and their bayonets were inspected, were found to have the old Snider bayonet converted, these bayonets having been in service for 30 years. The question of the bayonets has been engaging the attention of the Department for some years past. A considerable number—28,000, I believe—were ordered for use as far back as 1876; and I say, with humiliation, that of the quantity so ordered only 16,700 have been received, the contractors declaring that the tests imposed by the Department were much too severe for them to satisfy. Notwithstanding the tests were so severe, still further tests have been imposed, and I think the Committee will learn with satisfaction that every bayonet made since 1884 has satisfied the still increasing and more stringent conditions. But since the Egyptian Campaign every bayonet in store has been brought under test, and every bayonet in the hands of the troops has also been tested. At the present moment there is not a weapon in the hands of a British soldier in any part of the world which has not been exchanged or proved to satisfy the very severe conditions imposed by the Department. The Committee will be interested to know what was the actual result of the testing of the bayonets carried out by the Department. As a matter of fact, it was found that 4¾ per cent broke under the test, 4¾ per cent were condemned as being too small at the point, and 21½ per cent were found to be soft; but of that number which were held to be not sufficiently hard 75 per cent were made to satisfy the new conditions by re-tempering. Then, in regard to the test for the sword, I cannot look through the official records without seeing that the question of the sword has been a matter of continual controversy since as far back, at any rate, as 1853, and that it has been practically impossible to arrive at anything like an agreement as to what are the proper conditions of a serviceable sword in regard to weight, thrust, and cut. There is a difference of opinion in the different Services, and even among officers of the same regiment. The other day, for instance, the question of the swords for the Household regiments were reported upon, and of the three commanding officers two stated that the sword was perfectly satisfactory, the third being of a different opinion. The authorities of the much abused Ordnance Department have, I believe, demonstrated satisfactorily that a much better, a more serviceable, and a more scientific weapon can be produced; and, at the present moment, new designs are being tried which will be submitted to the usual test. There is a hope that we may now be able to arrive at a weapon suited to the special requirements of the Household troops. There was, I think, a sword adopted about 1882, which proved to be a very unsatisfactory weapon. It was a sword, the responsibility for which is not very easy to determine, as it was not arrived at by any deliberative Committee, and was, I believe, a sword submitted by an English contractor. It was, however, adopted, and it proved to be unsatisfactory. A special Committee was appointed, presided over by Major General Sir Drury Lowe, and that Committee reported on the 30th of April last year. The sword approved and adopted by that Committee is now being manufactured at Enfield, and is subjected to tests which I should like hon. Members to witness for themselves. It would be much more satisfactory if hon. Members who take an interest in the subject would go and see the tests applied at Enfield, and I think they will be convinced that they satisfy every conceivable condition that is required to be satisfied. The House has heard, from time to time, that there has been considerable difficulty owing to the swords not being made in England; but, as a matter of fact, the trade of the armourer has very much left our country, and we have had to rely upon manufacturers abroad. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, when last in Office, approved the giving an important contract for swords to a manufacturing firm at Solingen. The swords they produced are made under the inspection of persons specially appointed, and when submitted to our tests at Enfield they proved to be most excellent weapons. I must state that the process of manufacture is carried on under the inspection of a responsible Representative of the Ordnance Department, and so liberal ar thee manufacturers at Solingen that I believe they have invited an inspection of the process by other manufacturers. I should have been glad if some of our Sheffield and Birmingham houses had availed themselves of the invitation. It is regrettable, and worse, that we should be dependent upon foreigners for weapons which may be required for our own defence. The Committee, however, will be glad to know that our own manufactory at Enfield also produces these swords, and I think I may say that it is producing them in a manner highly creditable to the skill of those employed there. But with regard to swords and weapons of a similar class it must be remembered that there is no possibility of the Government encouraging their manufacture as a permanent business upon which people may rely for steady and continuous orders. The contracts now out are for 30,000, and it may well be hoped that no further order will be required within the next 20 years. Having referred to the testing of these swords, I must say that a short time ago I had the honour to accompany the Commander-in-Chief and Lord Wolseley, and I was glad to hear from them an expression of the highest and fullest satisfaction with the tests to which these weapons had been put in their presence. I come now to the Report of the Committee which is now in the hands of hon. Members upon the accident to the 43-ton gun on board the *Collingwood.* That Report has been dealt with very fully by the hon. and gallant Admiral the Member for Eastbourne (Admiral Field), and he speaks of it as conveying the condemnation of the Department. He said, I think, that the Committee stand condemned by their own Report.

ADMIRAL FIELD: I did not say that the Committee stood condemned, but that the Gun Factory did.

MR. WOODALL: But it is not the Report of the Gun Factory. The Report now submitted to the House is the Report of a perfectly impartial Committee. [*Cries of* "No!"] It is a Committee, at any rate, which my right hon. Friend the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) endeavoured to compose of the most authoritative and impartial persons. [An hon. MEMBER: No. Look at the Associated Members.] I shall have a word to say about the Associated Members by-and-bye. Reference has been made to a Report of an Ordnance Committee with Associated Members, which was appointed in 1885 by the noble Marquess behind me (the Marquess of Hartington). It must be remembered that this particular gun which burst on board the *Collingwood* was one of the type Mark II.; that it had passed through the ordinary tests; and that it had been fired nine times, with charges all of them larger, I think, than that under which it burst. I believe that four of the charges had been as high as 340 lbs., and that two guns of precisely the same type and the same manufacture, upon the same ship in the fore-turret had been fired successfully shortly before the accident to this particular gun. Although orders have been given to suspend the further firing of these guns, and of all guns of the same type pending the inquiry, and the decision to be arrived at by the Secretary of State upon that inquiry, I do not think it ought to be assumed that these guns are necessarily defective in their construction on account of this particular accident. Referring back to the Committee appointed by the noble Marquess in 1885, it will be remembered that that Committee was asked to report whether any alterations were required in the present method of treating steel for gun construction, and whether any alterations were required in guns already made, in the process of manufacture, or in guns for future manufacture. Well, Sir, it was determined in regard to guns for future manufacture that it was desirable that there should be a certain strengthening by means of chase-hooping, especially in regard to Marks III., IV., and V. Since that Report all the guns which have been made have been strongly chase-hooped, and I believe they have also been steel lined. The Committee will naturally ask, if this Committee of 1885 determined that guns should be made stronger in future than they had been in the past, how they could justify the passing of this particular gun, which actually at that time was on board of Her Majesty's ships? I have no authority to say that this consideration had any weight with the Committee; but will the House please to remember that at the very time that Committee was sitting the country was engaged in active preparations in anticipation of a possible war with Russia; that a Vote of Credit had been granted by this House in consequence; and that it was known perfectly well that the only weak part of this gun was that part, outside the turret, and to which, if any accident did occur, it would occur in such a way as to involve no danger to life? Furthermore, it was known that such an accident had occurred in France with regard to two heavy guns, which sustained exactly the same kind of injury —when the chases were cut off the guns were passed, and actually went through service, and are being used now at the present moment. In point of fact, after the accident to this 43-ton gun on board the *Collingwood*, it might have been fired continuously in action, although, no doubt, its usefulness had been diminished. Indeed, it would only have been a question of range, and the gun would have been not quite so accurate. In fact, like the hero in Chevy Chase—

> "In doleful dumps,
> For when his legs were smitten off
> He fought upon his stumps."

Notwithstanding what the hon. and gallant Admiral said, I think that the Report of the Committee ought to be very re-assuring in regard to the guns. The hon. and gallant Admiral says— "Let us have no more of these guns in the Navy;" but the hon. and gallant Admiral ought to know that the Navy have been relieved of these particular guns, and that six other guns of the higher mark which had been made for land service are nearly ready to replace those of the *Collingwood;* they only require to have an alteration made by the removal of the trunnion, in order to fit them for the naval carriages. The hon. and gallant Gentleman will also be glad to know that other guns of this higher type and further development, 16 in all, of Marks IV. and V. are being manufactured by Messrs. Armstrong and Messrs. Whitworth, and will be forthcoming in the course of the coming winter, or in the early part of next year. Well, Sir, the hon. and gallant Captain opposite (Captain Price) has brought before the Committee some considerations which are not quite new, but which I venture to think are very well worth the attention of the House and of the authorities. He complains that the Admiralty had not that full responsibility with regard to the selection of designs which they ought to have; he complains that they have not the determination of the design, and the ordering of the manufacture of the gun. Now, I think there is a misapprehension with regard to the extent to which the voice of the Admiralty is potent in these matters. I think I am right in saying that no gun has ever been supplied, at any rate in recent years, without having had a distinct and prior approval of the authorities of the Admiralty. As a matter of fact, it has always been open for the Admiralty to say whether they would prefer to have their guns produced at Woolwich or Elswick, or at any other factory. At any rate, such is certainly the case at the present moment. The Committee will, perhaps, be interested to know that very lately I have had the honour of serving on an inter-Departmental Committee, to consider how we could bring about a change in the condition of things under which these Estimates are presented to the House. It does certainly seem singular that the Army Estimates should include Votes for furnishing armaments for the Navy, and I think it would be more intelligible and, certainly in my judgment, very much better, in any case, that the Votes for naval guns should be included in the Navy Estimates, rather than in the Votes for the Army. But the Committee will not need to be told that there may be some other reasons of considerable weight which have prevented this common-sense arrangement from being carried out before. The difficulty hitherto has mainly rested with the Treasury; but, seeing that at the present moment the Navy obtains direct Votes for gun carriages, although they are made by the Ordnance Department, and seeing how admirably the system of repayment works with regard to the service of India and the Colonies, I cannot but feel that the consultation now going on between the different Departments will result in such an arrangement as will bring about a more satisfactory division of these Government Votes in the future. With regard to the Board of Naval Ordnance, of course it would be impertinent for me to say a word; but I must remark that upon the Permanent Ordnance Committee there has always been a full representation of the Admiralty, who have nominated some gentleman presumably possessing their confidence, so that their opinion has been as influential on the Board as that of any other Representative of the Department. The Committee would have been glad to hear that the hon. and gallant Captain the Member for Devonport disclaim the idea of having a separate arsenal for the production of naval armaments distinct from that for the Army. The Committee will see the immense advantage realized at the present time, even in the changing of guns of the *Collingwood* type, because, although the pattern may be to some extent different, the guns used for the land service are similar in design to those used for the sea, and it is easy at any time to accommodate the one to the exigencies of the other. That which is true in regard to armaments is still more important in regard to ammunition. I was rather surprised to hear that the Ordnance Committee recently appointed, although specially constituted, is regarded as not being an impartial Committee. Of course, in the selection of men for any conceivable inquiry, there may be somebody presumably left out of the Committee who would be capable of rendering able service to it. Among the Associated Members the only one who could be supposed to have any prejudice or bias in regard to the manufacture of the guns in question was Colonel Maitland, the Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factory. I think I heard one hon. Gentleman suggest that there ought to have been on the Committee some scientist, whose opinion in regard to metallurgical chemistry would have been valuable. That remark is, in my opinion, somewhat unfair, when we know that Sir Frederick Abel was a Member of the Committee; and Sir Frederick Abel, as all the world knows, is one of the most able men to be found in the scientific world. He is a man who has rendered great service to the State by the improvements he has effected, especially in regard to the explosives, and in the making of gun cotton. I should be very sorry indeed if a word were to be said in the course of this discussion to reflect upon that distinguished scientist, and the great value of the services he has been able to render as an Associated Member of the Committee. [Admiral FIELD: No one said a word against Sir Frederick Abel.] I am sorry to say that words have been used in the newspapers, and I hope it will not be considered wrong that I should say, at any rate, that Sir Frederick Abel is a man entitled to be held in high regard. There are other charges, with which the public are familiar, to which one can hardly omit some reference on this occasion. The Ordnance Committee, as originally composed, was selected from men in the service of the State. Surely it will be felt by the Committee that it was a particularly happy thought of the noble Marquess, in determining matters of the highest importance for the security of the country and the expenditure of the money voted by this House, to invite, and to be fortunate enough to secure, the co-operation of the most distinguished private firms in the Kingdom, and I think I may almost say in the world. To have got Messrs. Armstrong to send two of their most experienced representatives, and to have induced the great Whitworth firm to contribute one of its members—to have got these men to give to the country the benefit of their large experience and their practical knowledge; to have induced them to render that service gratuitously to the country, surely ought to entitle them to some acknowledgment of the services they have rendered. Let it be remembered that in regard to the recommendations of the Committee which is now before us, the Armstrong and Whitworth Members of it were asked to give an opinion on a gun with the manufacture of which they had not the slightest concern; nevertheless, the Government actually called in competitors to give the country the benefit of their opinion and advice upon a matter upon which they had not a shilling's worth of interest. We have heard a great deal of charges of corruption. The hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for North-West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) referred to those charges in a manner worthy of himself, and not one hon. Member who has spoken to-night has ventured to assume that there is any truth in the charges which have been made. The difficulty of meeting the charges, as far as I have had any knowledge of them, has been that they are not charges which name any individual, or specify any direct act which could possibly bring them under the cognizance of any Department. Had these charges been levelled against an individual, that individual would have had his remedy in a Court of Law; but the persons who have made the accusations have avoided that, while they have endeavoured to throw doubt and discredit upon a large class of men without directly incriminating anyone. Now, Sir, as a matter of fact, a great deal has been said in regard to the relations of the Armstrong firm with the Government. Those relations, I suppose, are matters of history. I can only say that, so far from its being necessary to have recourse to a subtle system for securing orders for the Armstrong firm, the difficulty is to get the Messrs. Armstrong to accept and execute the orders we require them to undertake. But the Armstrong guns are not merely made at Elswick. They are made also by us at Woolwich, although I do not believe that a single shilling has ever been paid for the Armstrong patent rights. The Armstrong guns are also made for us by the firm of Whitworths at Manchester, and at the present moment they have orders in hand on behalf of the Government. I can only repeat that which I have heard an hon. Gentleman behind me say — that we should be glad indeed if we could induce one of the great Sheffield houses to enter into the field of competition. The idea of any close kind of "ring," or of any monopoly on the part of any particular firm of manufacturers, is altogether absurd. It would serve no useful purpose to confine the work to Woolwich. We not only carry on the manufacture of guns at Woolwich, but we invite the competition of private firms; and certainly it is a wise policy that the country should not be dependent either upon one or the other, but that we should have as many competing and contributory influences at work as we can possibly obtain. I certainly hope, and do not doubt, that the Ordnance Committee, from time to time, will, as far as possible, be strengthened by outside help. I am sorry that I had occasion to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman the other night in reference to a misapprehension into which the Lord Chief Justice of England fell when he spoke of the Ordnance Committee as having to select particular firms for the supply of ordnance. I find that the Editor of *The Fortnightly Review*, in commenting upon one short article which had been substituted for another which had been withdrawn, declares that the English Government keeps salaried officials to buy weapons for them of the kind and at the price they think fit, and that these same officials are, at the same time, allowed to buy weapons of their own private manufacture. It is surprising that people should take so little care to acquaint themselves with the facts of the case before expressing opinions at once so dogmatic and so inaccurate. As a matter of fact—and I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will bear me out—no Member of the Ordnance Committee, and no one who has been associated with that Committee, has the slightest authority in determining contracts for anything whatever. I am afraid that I have occupied the attention of the Committee longer than I ought to do; but we must, in acknowledging the occasional failure of our weapons, remember how rapid and how important is the continual progress and development of science in regard to instruments of warfare. If we could agree with other countries to have a truce for the next 10 years, I believe that it would be a "Truce of God" indeed. Sir, we must assume from the experience of the past, that the weapons we are making to-day will very likely be obsolete at the end of that time. But surely we must see in that the absolute necessity of bringing into a focus and applying the highest scientific skill and experience which can be found in any part of the world. We must try to make our own manufactures as perfect in engineering appliances and in administration as possible. I entertain great hopes that something may be done by the Commission which was appointed by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), and which has the good fortune to be presided over by Lord Morley, and which is to give its attention to everything concerning the administration and management of the Government Factories. I heard it stated that there is to be a further investigation and possible inquiry into the spending Departments of the State. If that be the case, these Departments which are now entrusted with the expenditure of a large proportion of the taxes of the country cannot, and ought not, and must not escape a full investigation. I feel that while it is desirable that independent Committees should from time to time be called into operation, the right hon. Gentleman opposite, with his great experience, will not feel inclined to shelter himself behind any Committee or Commission. I am perfectly sure that he will not shirk any responsibility which may possibly rest upon him in the important position which he occupies. I believe, also, that he, or any other man called to such an important position, will find himself supported by a permanent Staff as honourable in their integrity as I believe them to be able in the technical skill they possess. I also feel sure that when the facts are brought under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman he will, while discarding all personal conditions, and severely dealing with proved incapacity or misconduct, he will, on the other hand, defend the men who look to him for the vindication of their character against indefinite and slanderous accusations such as those which have been so familiar of late.

Admiral Sir JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): It is not my intention to deal with what is called the Ordnance scandal. That, no doubt, will be made a question of law; but I think that the country, and, above all, we who belong to the Navy, have a right to ask how it is that our ordnance is in the wretched state in which it is at present? Our seamen cannot go on board ship with any satisfaction feeling that the weapons placed in their hands to fight with are trustworthy. Unfortunately, they consider that there may be a great deal more danger to those who are in the rear of the gun than to those who are in front of it. It must not be supposed that the *Collingwood* gun was the first that has burst. The first one that burst was a gun on board the *Thunderer.* That gun did not burst in such a manner that it was possible to cut off the chase and use it again; but it burst in the turret and dealt death and destruction all round. It was said at the time that the gun was double loaded. All I can say is that I do not believe there is a single naval officer who was on the station at the time and heard the evidence that was given who could believe for a single moment that that gun was double loaded. The impression is that it was said to be double loaded for the purpose of covering the badness of the gun. I quite concur with the hon. and gallant Admiral the Member for Eastbourne (Admiral Field) that it would be folly to retain the other 14 guns of the same pattern as that which burst on board the *Collingwood*, because all guns of that kind may be strengthened by re-hooping them. Instead of tinkering, it would be far better to sell them for what they would fetch, and put the expense down to the cost of our education in the manufacture of guns. At any rate, we shall have learnt something—namely, that our guns ought to be made by the first machinists in the world, and until they are we may depend upon it that English ordnance will not be relied upon. There are one or two things in regard to which I do not agree in what I have heard from hon. and gallant Members on this side of the House. In the first place, I do not believe in the propriety of testing heavy guns too severely. I believe myself that a gun, which, after all, is not a long-lived machine, may be utterly and entirely ruined by being over-tested. We found that out in the tests that were applied to the chain cables. Over and over again chain cables were tested beyond their strength, until it was found that they were never reliable, and that they frequently gave way when it was least expected. Let me mention another point. These guns were never designed to fire the powder which was in them when they burst. Guns of the *Collingwood* type were made for the purpose of being fired with quick-burning powder, and therefore they were strengthened at the breech. When charged with slow-burning powder, which the gun was never intended to use, it naturally burst, because the charge brought great force to bear upon parts which had not sufficient thickness of metal to resist it. It is easy to understand that guns cannot be reliable if they are made to fire one kind of powder and are then charged with another kind. I have no hesitation in saying that there is the greatest possible distrust on the part of the Navy in our system of naval ordnance, both with regard to the way we obtain it and with regard to the guns themselves. What the Navy requires is a little Home Rule in the matter, and to be allowed, when the Vote for guns has been obtained, to order its guns where the order would be executed in the best and quickest manner. We ask for power to settle things in our own way; to be able to order our guns where we think we can get them best; and not only that, but where we think we shall be able to get them quickest. I have known a ship to remain in commission for three years, and although month after month and quarter after quarter demands were made on the Ordnance Department for spare gear it was never forthcoming. Why was this? It was because we were not allowed to have Home Rule, and to settle our things in our own way. Then, again, the destination of a ship which was originally ordered to the North American Station has been suddenly changed to the Mediterranean. Shot, shell, and powder might have been sent out to the North American Station, besides that taken by the ship herself; and as none was sent out to the Mediterranean the ship became absolutely useless, because the men were unable to practise and fire the guns, the powder and ammunition that were required to replace that expended having been sent to another place. I should like to ask whose fault that was? If any accident occurred, and the vessel had become entirely useless, you may depend upon it that the fault would have been attributed to the unfortunate captain and the Commanding Officer on the station. We see every year collisions between the Ordnance Department and the Admiralty. I do not mean to say that the Surveyor General of Ordnance and the Ordnance Department do not endeavour, as much as possible, to meet the views of naval officers, when they ask for a particular gun, or a particular weapon; but what I maintain is that it would be far better to leave the matter altogether in the hands of the Naval Authorities to settle for themselves. As the hon. and gallant Member for Eastbourne has stated, we build the ship, rig the ship, and fight the ship; but we are not allowed to arm it. We have no desire to set up a rival establishment to that of Woolwich, or to spend one sixpence on our own account; but I have no hesitation in saying that one of the cheapest things which the nation could possibly do would be to allow the Navy to make its own arrangements for its armaments. I am satisfied that if that were done the expenditure would not exceed two-thirds of the present outlay. There is another question with regard to the guns which ought to be thoroughly gone into. As I said before, this is not the first gun that has been rendered utterly useless in action. The other day, on the China Station, a 64-pounder, Mark III., burst. What was the result? There was immediately a telegram from the Admiralty that no gun on any station of Mark III. was to be fired. The consequence was that upon my own station, in North America, more than one-half of the guns were, with one stroke of the Admiralty pen, put *hors de combat*. Now, was that a right course to take? Have we not substantial grounds for complaining? I should like to know what the country would have said if war had suddenly broken out, if that order had been carried out, and we had gone into action with more than one-half of our armaments useless, because a gun in China had burst? In consequence of a gun having burst on the China Station, the Admiralty say they will not take the responsibility of allowing guns of a similar type to be fired anywhere; and, therefore, one-half of the guns of the British Empire are to be wiped out at once. Then, again, as to ammunition. Not only are the guns of the Navy in an unsatisfactory condition, but the powder, fuses, and shells are often given out in such a state that they can hardly be used. But what are we told? The late Surveyor General of Ordnance says it was a mistake; it was one of those unfortunate things which did occasionally occur, and that the truth of the matter is that certain weapons had been served out which had been in store for 30 years. I should like to know what right the Ordnance Department have to send out, in modern days, weapons which have been in store for 30 years? Why have they not been surveyed and condemned? Is it any satisfaction, when an enemy runs you through, to be told that your own weapon was bad in consequence of having been in store for so many years?

Mr. WOODALL: I did not say that they were served out direct from the stores.

Admiral Sir JOHN COMMERELL: At any rate, they had been placed in the hands of the troops for use, and it would appear, from the explanation of the hon. Gentleman, that bayonets had been allowed to be in the hands of a regiment for 30 years without having been returned, in order to ascertain whether they were perfect, or whether any reliance could be placed upon them. The truth of the matter is, that one of the principal reasons for the shortcomings of the Ordnance is the fact that the appointments of Surveyor General of the Ordnance, and of other officials, are made to depend upon political exigencies. They are not placed in the hands of officials who know who the best men are, and who can speak from their own knowledge without being dependent upon notes supplied to them by others. I am myself a sailor, and as a sailor I say what I mean. We should have professional men to do professional duty. The present system of appointment is unreasonable, and it might just as well be said that the Prime Minister should be made Admiral of the Channel Fleet, or the Archbishop of Canterbury Chancellor of the Exchequer, as that it should be allowed to continue.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester): Sir, I trust, as an old Artillery officer, that I shall not be considered by the Committee as interfering in this discussion by making a few observations. We have not yet been informed, by any hon. Member who has spoken, of one very important point—namely, that in this Vote there is a sum of no less than £294,727 put down on account of the Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich, for the manufacture and repair of the guns in this financial year. That seems to me to be a very large sum, when I call to mind the enormous amount of public money which has been spent on guns during the last 30 years, and I think the point for our consideration is what we have got in return for it. I recently put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War with regard to Ordnance stores; and in justice to myself, and in order to remove any wrong impression there might be as to my motive of putting this Question, I should like to make a few observations. My hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) has alluded to the Questions I put in this House with regard to the complaints made during the wars in Egypt and the Soudan, of swords breaking, cartridges jamming, and other matters, respecting which the General Officer commanding in the field sent home Reports. I have been inundated with letters and papers, amongst others *The Naval and Military Magazine* and *The Horse Guards' Gazette*, which have revealed some very unpleasant facts, and have made charges, of which it puzzles me to think no notice has yet been taken. Accordingly, I thought it right to ascertain what truth or falsity there might be in those accusations. I conceive it to be the duty of every Member of this House, when he sees in the Press statements of this kind, attributing waste and extravagance with regard to public money, or otherwise making charges against persons in the Public Service, to call attention to the fact, and to ask Ministers responsible for the Department either to confirm, or to give a refutation of, those accusations. Well, Sir, in putting the Question I have referred to I acted in the belief that I was doing my duty, and I acted innocently. I am sure that Ministers concerned would themselves be most anxious to ascertain the truth as to the accusations, and to refute them, if possible; and, further, I was acting on good advice, because I recollect that a certain noble Lord, no mean authority in this House or out of it, said in one of his speeches that Conservatives and Radicals alike desired to have the most efficient Army in the world; that they desired to have their money's worth, which at present they did not get; and that to have it they must destroy the system of corruption which prevailed at Woolwich and elsewhere, and give their orders to English manufacturers, which course of action would give them a more efficient and powerful Army than they had before. Upon that advice I put the Question which I did put. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: When was it I said this?] Of course, I accept the repudiation of the noble Lord, but will endeavour to furnish him in a day or two with the speech from which I quoted. Sir, I can only express the hope that the questions I have put will be accepted in the spirit in which they were asked; and I trust the Committee will understand that they were asked in an independent and disinterested spirit; for I am neither a disappointed manufacturer or contractor, nor have I any shares or interest in any journal concerned in pointing out deficiencies in any of our Military Departments. Now, with reference to those blemishes to which so many references have been made, I wish to point out one or two things. I think the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price) referred to a "close circle" at Woolwich. No doubt there has existed through all these years what is called a monopoly—that is to say, there has been practically a partnership between the Government and a private firm—that of Armstrong, Mitchell, and Co.—I think the whole history of the subject points to that. The hon. Gentleman who addressed the House just now (Mr. Woodall) stated that Whitworth and Co. had an order for guns. That is quite true; but I think that was given by the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State for War during the short time in which he was in Office last year. Reference has been made to the Ordnance Committee which sat first in June, 1882. That Committee consisted of four Artillery officers and three Naval officers, and the duty of that Ordnance Committee was to report upon, examine, adopt, or reject any designs for improvements in guns. I am sorry to hear that the hon. Gentleman opposite supposes that any imputations at all bordering on dishonesty were made upon the Ordnance Committee. But I fancy the idea is, perhaps, that it would be better if the Gentlemen upon the Committee did not possess any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, in gun manufacturing firms. They probably have to advise, although I do not know to what extent; and with regard to any advice they give, we are quite certain that it is given conscientiously. But it is only natural that if a man has a large interest in any particular firm he should have a prejudice or bias in favour of that firm. He would be more than human if it were not so; and, therefore, with all deference, I submit that it would be more satisfactory to the public, and I venture to think more satisfactory to the gentlemen concerned, that while they are Members, or Associated Members, of the Ordnance Committee they should cease to be members of any firm of ordnance manufacturers. It was only on Thursday last, I think, that in reply to the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir

William Crossman), we were informed that Sir Donald Stewart had at once resigned his position on the directorate of the Nordenfelt Gun Company, on the impropriety of his holding that position being pointed out to him. Therefore, I think it would be better if the gentlemen to whom I have referred were to cease to have any interest in private gun manufacturing firms. [*Laughter.*] I am not surprised that the noble Lord laughs at that; I am aware that it is impossible to prevent investments in any particular Company by persons holding Crown appointments; but I think it would be better if some pressure were brought to bear upon them for the purpose of inducing them to select investments other than those in question. Now, to proceed to the history of these heavy guns. We will begin with the 6-inch gun, one of which burst on board the *Active.* Shortly after the first 6-inch gun was designed by Armstrong and Co., in June, 1881, another gun was designed by the Royal Gun Factory at Woolwich, which was supposed to be more efficient, inasmuch as it was to carry a heavier charge with greater muzzle velocity. I believe that altogether 135 guns of this type were made, of which the Navy had 108. In May, 1882, five of these guns burst, and another burst in October; and it was decided by the Ordnance Committee that the charge should be greatly reduced in consequence. But, Sir, a remarkable fact came out before the Committee of Investigation that had to report on the bursting of the *Active* gun. This was that the Ordnance Committee had signed and sealed the design of the Royal Gun Factory Mark II., and before, as they stated, they had had an opportunity of considering the design! I say that this is rather a remarkable thing for the Ordnance Committee to do. The duty of the Ordnance Committee was to examine that design; but, for some reason or other, they signed and sealed the design without any examination whatever. Then, Sir, I point out that the Ordnance Committee proposes that in future all these guns should be made in steel. Well, that would render obsolete all the guns made of the pattern known as Mark II. Then, with regard to the 100-ton gun, which was the design of Sir William Armstrong; four of these were bought by the Government. It is a curious fact that sometime before that the Italian Government had ordered four 100-ton guns, one of which having burst, the Italian Government repudiated the whole number. Were these the four guns that Her Majesty's Government paid for, two of which were sent to Gibraltar, and another to Malta, but none of which have been allowed to be fired? Then, in regard to the 38-ton guns on the *Ajax*, after a few rounds in practice the vents got out of order, and further practice has been forbidden with these guns. The next gun under consideration is the 43-ton gun, which was designed by the Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factory at Woolwich. It was a gun of this kind which burst on board the *Collingwood*, and it is this gun which is in question at the present moment. None of these guns are now allowed to be fired; and the idea is that they should be strengthened by chase-hooping. But it seems to me open to some doubt whether this would make them safe; for the strongest gun is no stronger than its weakest part, and, however slight may be the spaces between the "hoops," each space may in itself contain the element of possible risk of fracture. It seems to me the best plan would be to form a complete steel jacket or sleeve to pass over the whole gun. The cost of the chase-hooping is estimated at £25,000. It was suggested by one who was outside the "close circle," at the time that the design of these guns was under consideration, that the weight of the gun was insufficient; and I may mention that a similar gun of the Russian Government has a weight of 51½ tons. Although the suggestion that each gun should have a greater weight of metal was pooh-poohed, yet it has turned out to be correct. Well, Sir, it seems to me neither politic nor wise to come down on the taxpayers for such costly experiments in guns, and which have proved to be of little credit to the British nation. In my opinion, the country requires, and demands, in view of the enormous taxation put upon it by the Admiralty and War Office, a thoroughly efficient supply of guns; that the money voted by Parliament should be properly expended and accurately accounted for. For these reasons, and having regard to the explosions which have taken place on board our ships, and the large amount of public money which has been spent in recent years, I am inclined to demur to so large a sum being voted as that which is now asked for, and shall move that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £50,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,319,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores for Land and Sea Service (including Establishments of Manufacturing Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."—(*Colonel Hughes-Hallett.*)

SIR EDWARD REED: I wish to say a few words on the desire expressed by more than one hon. and gallant Member near me, with regard to giving the Authorities at the Admiralty larger powers than they have already. It is true that, for a long time past, there has been a Director of Naval Ordnance, and that the Navy has also exercised an influence in other ways in connection with the supply of guns for the Navy. But within the whole period of my experience the Navy had thrust upon it guns which, notwithstanding the protests made against them at the time, were absolutely unfit for the Service. The reason of that is that the Navy has had a very subordinate position as regarded the representation in connection with the Gunnery Service, and the War Office a very predominant influence. It is within my own knowledge that, for a number of years, all classes in the Service desired to have breech-loading guns. These guns were refused, and we fell behind as a Naval Power. We are placed in a position of discredit in comparison with the Navies of the world, because the wishes and knowledge of competent naval authorities have been ignored and thwarted by another Department in this matter, and this will continue until some step is taken to bring about a change. Now, the change which has been intimated by my hon. Friend beside me (Mr. Woodall) is a very remarkable one. He proposes to make a concession to the Navy in this respect—namely, that a certain sum is to be taken from the Army Estimates and put on the Navy Estimates. That is all that he proposes, and what will be the immediate effect of that? A great injury, in fact, to the Navy; because the public Press, and not a few Members of this House, will deal with the corrected Navy Estimates as if they were increased Estimates, so that the change will be detrimental to the Navy, unless there is associated with it another change which will give some real advantage. I should be sorry to say anything with regard to influence, or improper influence, in connection with Public Departments; but I wish, by the way of caution to Her Majesty's Government, to point out that there is a widespread feeling that the relations existing between the Public Service and private individuals are becoming much more intimate than they ought to be. I hope to be forgiven for referring to this, because on this subject the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) recently asked the Committee to accept with implicit confidence, and without question, every statement made from the Treasury Bench by a responsible Minister.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I said "receive statements as made in good faith."

SIR EDWARD REED: I have heard statements made in good faith which have been very false and wrong in themselves—very misleading statements. I remember in a former Parliament, when the right hon. Gentleman himself was First Lord of the Admiralty, a paragraph appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, alleging that an officer of the Admiralty was engaged in designing a ship for a foreign Government, that a Question was put in this House, asking whether that statement was true, and the right hon. Gentleman got up, and, somewhat snubbing the hon. Member who asked it, said there was no truth in it. But I happened to know that there was a good deal of truth in it. An officer of the Admiralty had been employed in furnishing a design. Well, Sir, I stated the facts to the right hon. Gentleman, and he went down to the Admiralty to ascertain whether his statement or mine was correct. I believe that he found mine to be; but I am not aware that up to this time he has withdrawn the snubbing he gave to the hon. Member, or corrected the statement which he made in this House. Some time ago I was invited to the Admiralty by Lord Northbrook, through Mr. Trevelyan, to see a design of one of Her Majesty's ships, the *Impérieuse.* I went to see it, and was informed that though the coal supply was 400 tons they had coal space for 900 tons. I pointed out that this was wholly an insufficient supply. Notwithstanding that, the Minister, when he came down to the House, suppressed the fact that the real supply was only 400 tons, and gave it as if it were 900 tons. And thus the matter remained, the House being under the misconception until the noble Lord had explained the real facts of the case. I say that it is not proper that this House should be misled by Ministers, and that if Ministers make inaccurate statements at any time they should come down and correct them as soon as the actual facts come to their knowledge. But what is the state of affairs at present? I have said that the guns have not been supplied to the Navy as desired, and that the consideration of the state of things at present existing will show the reason for this. At the present time the official whose duty it is to advise the Government as to the qualities of different guns, and who should be in a position to form an independent judgment, is actually a consulting official of the Armstrong firm. That is the state of things at this moment. The noble Lord stated that this gentleman is not in receipt of any pay. That may be so; but does the noble Lord suppose that this House will endure the continuance of the state of things, in which the officers of Public Departments are in league with private establishments? For my part, I am sure that the country will rise up and put an end to this system.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I rise to Order. I observe a disposition to introduce a discussion relating to the supply of ordnance to the Navy; and I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the hon. Gentleman is in Order in alluding to transactions concerning which I shall be perfectly ready to meet him at the proper time, but which I submit do not come within this Vote?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. COURTNEY) (Cornwall, Bodmin): I understand the hon. Gentleman to be illustrating the connection between a Public Department and private firms. I do not think he has yet committed any breach of Order.

SIR EDWARD REED: At this moment the officer most largely interested in the ordnance of Her Majesty's ships, the man who can bring the most influence to bear upon the expenditure of the money we are now asked to vote, is an officer of Armstrong's firm, inasmuch as he is the consulting officer of the firm. That being so, I certainly do not think my remarks are at all open to objection from the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton). I do not wish to pursue the subject; but I should have been wanting in justice to myself, and in justice to my constituents and to the Committee, if I had failed to ask the Front Bench to bear in mind that they may easily fall into the error—a very old one—of refusing to see anything wrong in a Public Department when other people see a great deal that is wrong. No good can come from that state of things, either to themselves or to anyone else. With regard to the *Collingwood's* guns, I must say I am unable to feel the interest in them which some hon. Gentlemen feel. I have very little interest in the *Collingwood*, and I feel very little confidence in the manner in which the *Collingwood's* guns are placed in the ship. My hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Woodall) spoke of the part of the *Collingwood's* gun which was blown away as being the part which was outside the turret. She does not happen to have any turret. If he calls a barbette a turret, I suppose the whole gun is outside the turret. It is only connected with the machinery within the barbette, and with the ship itself by a couple of straps, each an inch and a half thick. Sir, I believe the ordnance of Her Majesty's Navy has been constructed upon wrong principles, and upon principles very materially unfitted for naval service. The guns that we are dealing with now are to be chase-hooped: they are long slender tubes, preposterous in length, wholly unsuited by virtue of their length for Her Majesty's ships, in many cases projecting from the ship so stupidly, because so extensively, that an enemy need not fire at the ships, but simply swoop past her and break away their guns owing to their imense projection. There are guns in the Naval Service which ought never to have been there, and which no one in his senses ought ever to have thought of putting there. This chase-hooping simply means another case of strengthening up, with additional hoops and additional material, these guns which are of a slender and improper type. Mr. Courtney, I do not know how it is to be brought about, I am sure; but I am confident that the naval ordnance of the country requires the most searching examination and the most extensive change. When I came down to the House I had no intention of speaking; but I could not help appealing to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) not to give us a speech which will give Parliament and the country no satisfaction, but to create—what I am sorry to say my hon. Friends failed to do—a feeling that the men charged with the responsible duties of the State, confronted as they are with great failures and errors committed in their own Departments, are not insensible to the great wrong that has been done to the country in bringing those failures and errors about, but will use their high abilities and high stations for the purpose of remedying the defects and giving the country what it is entitled to —namely, the very best materials that money will buy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Mr. Courtney, we see that there is, at least, one advantage in a change of Government. The hon. Gentleman (Sir Edward Reed), who has just sat down, has delivered a speech which I am sure very much interested the Committee, and he has addressed me in terms to which I most cordially and heartily respond. He has asked me to use whatever abilities I possess in order to give the country the very best material it can have, in order to give it the best system which can be produced, so that the conditions which he thinks are injurious to the welfare of the Navy may be put an end to. Well, Sir, for six months the hon. Gentleman sat on this Bench as a Member of the Government; he had previously to that acquired all that extensive knowledge and that great information part of which he has conveyed to the Committee this evening; and not a single word during that six months was uttered to the House and the Government in warning of the course which Her Majesty's Government were pursuing.

SIR EDWARD REED: Sir, will the right hon. Gentleman excuse me for saying that he is misrepresenting me in the most extraordinary manner? It is within the memory of hon. Members of this House that I have, over and over again, made statements in it precisely to the same effect that I have made now.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I repeat what I have said, and the Committee may judge whether I am in the slightest degree acting unfairly to the hon. Gentleman. He has great means of information; he has great knowledge as a designer of ships; and he claims to have great knowledge on the subject of guns. He sat on this Bench during the whole of the last six months with the late Government, and he was silent as to the condition of things which he now condemns. I am not responsible for the present condition of things, as he well knows. [Sir EDWARD REED: I did not say so.] I know he did not; but I say it is a marvellous transformation which the hon. Gentleman has executed. The hon. Gentleman takes the opportunity of falling upon his late Colleagues and all who have gone before him in the Offices which they held, for having made false and wrong statements, for refusing to see anything wrong, and for constructing the war material of the country on wrong principles. The hon. Gentleman was good enough to say that statements made in good faith are false and wrong. Now, why are they false and wrong? Because those who know that they are false and wrong have not the courage and the honesty to denounce those who make such statements by name in the House of Commons and in the country. The hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County (Mr. Molloy) referred, in terms of which I make no complaint whatever, to what he described as the Ordnance scandal. He said that it was believed that there were persons who were receiving commissions and fees; that charges of dishonour had been made publicly in newspapers—charges of a character utterly disgraceful to officers and gentlemen. [Mr. MOLLOY: If true.] Yes, if true. Well, Sir, it is within the recollection of the House that I have appealed to the House, once, twice, thrice, in the course of this Session, to any Member of this House, or any other person who had personal knowledge of any charge to be brought against an officer in the Queen's Service, to state the charge to me, confidentially if he was unwilling to state it publicly; but under any circumstances to bring it to my notice in such a form that I, with the aid of the Law Officers of the Crown, could find a judicial tribunal to deal with the scandal, whatever it might be. It is a very common belief that Ministers are anxious to screen the Departments over which they are placed; it is a common belief, both inside and outside the House, that we have some interest and motive in protecting abuses and hiding scandals, in covering up the sore. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen are supposed to have an interest in preventing the full and complete discovery of any evil that may exist. Speaking for myself, and, I believe, for hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, speaking for everyone who has ever held high Office under the Crown, I say there is no one thing we desire more than to be able to put our finger upon any abuse, and to expose it, as the hon. Gentleman (Sir Edward Reed) said, mercilessly. I undertake to say that if any proof—no; I will not say proof, I will rather repeat what I said a few days ago—any *primâ facie* case can be made out imputing to any single officer in the Ordnance Department malversation, corruption, fraud, or conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, I will find a tribunal which shall deal with the charge, and I will have it investigated to the bottom. I have invited such charges; and in reply I am told the only course which those who make them will take is to make the charges if there be created a tribunal at present unknown to the law. As a condition to bringing these charges to my knowledge, and to the knowledge of the Law Officers of the Crown, it is demanded that the guilty person—the briber if he be a briber—shall be insured against any consequences of his conduct, before he discloses any evidence which will incriminate the person he has bribed. I do not know what the Committee think of a demand of that character—a demand of gentlemen who assert that they have knowledge of these irregularities, a demand of gentlemen who have been in conflict with the Department more or less for the last 10, 15, 20, or 30 years. I make no imputation against them. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Molloy) referred to the fact that there are inventors. He said that the Ordnance Committee has to deal with inventors, and that it is looked upon as a body which occasionally discourages inventors. Well, Sir, inventors are very useful and necessary persons in this country; they have conferred enormous advantages upon it. Steel ordnance is the result of invention, and a great deal more of the strength and power of this country is the result of invention. But there are inventors, as we must all know, who have greater confidence in their own inventions than the most impartial tribunal which is appointed to consider them; and these inventors have arrived at the conclusion that the only cause for the refusal to entertain their invention is corruption; that there is some corrupt personal influence which prevents the Committee entertaining inventions which are to transform the ordnance of the country, which are to give it new life and new power, and make the country absolutely invincible. Well, Sir, if charges are brought by gentlemen in this position in the vague and general manner to which I have referred, I think I am entitled to say, for the protection of officers who have served Her Majesty with unblemished reputation for many years, that I, as Secretary of State, and the Law Officers of the Crown, must be satisfied that there is a *primâ facie* case, before we undertake to throw upon them the imputation that they are unworthy the commission which they hold in the Service of the Crown. I will not enter upon the discussion which has been dealt with by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff. He says that we refuse to see anything wrong. I have already said, I entreat anybody who knows of anything wrong to bring it to my knowledge; and I repeat that there is no object I desire to obtain more completely than the satisfaction of the public mind, as well as my own mind, as to the perfect integrity with which the Service is conducted. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Molloy) referred to the bayonets which, he said, are useless for the Public Service. I wish to tell the hon. Gentleman that every charge of that kind, whenever it is brought to the knowledge of the authorities, is examined, not by the Department itself, but, as a rule, by a perfectly independent body of officers, who report upon it. This body has no interest in the matter, except the interest of the Army. If there is any truth in the statement of the hon. Gentleman, we will undertake that the requisite remedy should be forthwith provided. But, from the documents which I possess, I think I could prove, even to the satisfaction of the hon. Gentleman, that as regards bayonets, swords, and other weapons, each case has been dealt with in succession by past Administrations, honestly and openly; openly, because it has been examined, as I have said, by officers who are themselves independent of the War Department. With regard to cartridges, there was, no doubt, a mistake made; but as soon as the matter was brought to the knowledge of the War Department, it was resolved that, from that time forward, solid-drawn cartridges should be issued for service, and an order was sent to Woolwich for a large quantity to be made. Of course, for the purposes of practice the Boxer cartridge is just as good as the solid-drawn cartridge. The hon. Gentleman, referring to the invitation I gave to anyone to come forward with any charge they may have against the Ordnance Department, said I required that the charge should be substantiated. I made no such request. I required, as I have said just now, that a *primâ facie* case should be made out which would justify an inquiry; just such a case as that which a Grand Jury requires to be made against a prisoner before they pass the bill of indictment. Our object is, undoubtedly, to convict the guilty; and I appeal to the hon. Member, and to every Member of this House, if he has knowledge of any guilty act, not to shield the guilty, but to come to me, or to some other Member of Her Majesty's Government, and to state the facts of the case in any form in which he may think fit, so as to put it in our power to clear up the matter. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North-West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) said that the country demands an investigation. The hon. Gentleman the late Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Woodall) referred to a Committee of Investigation which the late Secretary of State for War appointed. It appears to me that the Reference to the Committee did not include all the subjects which might be interesting and of importance to the country, and I have, therefore, decided to nominate another Committee, or small Commission, to inquire into the complaints which have been made within the last five years as to patterns in warlike stores—and warlike stores include guns, powder, and projectiles of every class—then or now in use in Her Majesty's Service, into the system under which the patterns of such stores have been adopted and the stores passed into the Service, and to report whether any improvement can be effected in the system.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Will it be a Departmental Committee?

MR. W. H. SMITH: No, it will not; no Departmental officer will sit on the Committee. It will be made, as far as possible, a Judicial Committee, with the object of providing a complete statement for the satisfaction of the country and of the House of Commons as to the state of affairs at the present time and during the last five years. The result of the inquiry will be made public, and the evidence received by the Committee will be published; therefore, the information will be complete so far as the House is concerned. Now, in appointing this Committee, I desire to say that I, myself, do not cast the slightest imputation or entertain any doubt on the capacity and zeal with which the country has been served during the last five years; but I admit, and everyone who is at all reasonable must admit, that there is an impression abroad that the condition of things is not so good as it ought to be—that mistakes have been made, and, if you please, that fraud has been committed. I hope this Committee will be able to state to the House and the country the accurate state of affairs, and it will be my endeavour to constitute that Committee as strongly and independently as possible. Reference has been made in the course of the debate to the Ordnance Select Committee. I should like to tell the Committee of whom this body is composed. The Committee consists of Lieutenant General Sir Michael Biddulph, as President; Rear Admiral Le Hunte-Ward, as Vice President; Major General Fraser, Royal Artillery; Colonel Bayley, Captain Jenkins, Royal Navy; Lieutenant Colonel Davies, Major Colquhoun, Captain Hammill; and there are two civil members, Mr. Barlow and

Sir Frederick Bramwell. The functions of this Committee are to consider the designs of guns. It has nothing whatever to do with the ordering of the guns; it has no relation of any kind whatever with the makers of the guns; it has simply to consider the designs of the guns by the light of the experiments which are carried on at Shoeburyness, and under its own direction. It has been remarked by some hon. Gentlemen that Sir William Armstrong, Captain Noble, Mr. Gledhill, and Sir Joseph Whitworth were added as Associate Members to this Committee. The hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Woodall) referred to the circumstances under which those gentlemen were asked to serve on the Committee. They had nothing to do as Associate Members with the designs of the guns and their manufacture. They have never been asked to assist the Committee with the view of designing the guns; but when those accidents occurred, when the circumstances seemed to require that the Government should acquire the largest amount of information at their disposal, the Government of the day, through the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) asked these gentlemen, with their knowledge of explosives and construction of guns, knowledge which they had acquired in the conduct of their own business, to assist the Committee. Well, Sir, I am not responsible for the acts of the noble Marquess; but I think it fair to my Predecessors—my political opponents if you like—to say I believe both the noble Marquess and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) acted in the best interest of the country in availing themselves of the skill and the knowledge of the only practical gunmakers in England who had any experience in the manufacture of steel; and is it to be supposed that, when an accident occurred, the persons who had most knowledge of the conditions under which a gun is capable of standing the strain and enduring the pressure put upon it, are to be excluded from a Committee, and to be excluded from giving advice to the country, because they had carried on a trade which has given them their knowledge? There are no other persons in England of whom I am aware who possess the knowledge which these men possess, and I think the late Government did wisely in acquiring the information which these gentlemen could give as to the cause of the bursting of the *Collingwood's* gun. It must be borne in mind that these guns were not made at Elswick by Sir William Armstrong and Co., or at Manchester by Sir Joseph Whitworth and Co. If they had been made by Sir Joseph Whitworth and Co., or by Sir William Armstrong and Co., it would have been improper to place them on a Committee to determine the cause of the bursting of the gun. If these gentlemen had been actuated by such motives as some hon. Gentlemen imagined, they must have been strongly inclined to find out defects in the make of the gun, because it was not theirs. But let me regard the matter from a still broader standpoint. It is infinitely to the interest of the country that both Armstrong's firm and Whitworth's firm, and any similar firm we can find in this country, should arrive at a process of manufacturing guns which will give perfect confidence and perfect security, and, therefore, the knowledge which they might acquire in the examination of the cause of the bursting of the gun was knowledge which would be beneficial to the country at large, even if it tended to forward their own interests. I have been asked by an hon. Friend behind me whether this Committee is the best body we could find to carry on the work which is entrusted to them. He asks me whether I am of opinion that the Ordnance Committee, which consists, as I have said, of gentlemen belonging to the different branches of the Service and of two civil engineers, is the best Committee for the work they have to do? I think that can be determined by the Committee which I hope to appoint, and which I hope will report very shortly. I can only say for myself that I think the country would not act wisely in rapidly coming to a conclusion that men who have arrived at this position by the process of natural selection, who have not been appointed by any Party influence of any kind or by the influence of any clique, but who have acquired information and knowledge of a most valuable character, should be dismissed because some guns which are perfectly new in manufacture and constructed of material which was unknown for the purpose of gun manufacture five years ago have failed. It must be borne in mind that during the last five years we have been passing through a complete change in ordnance manufacture. We have changed from iron to steel; we have changed from small to very heavy and very big guns; we have changed from quick-burning powder to slow-burning powder; and all these changes have been going on together, under circumstances which have thrown a great strain upon the ingenuity and the skill and the knowledge of our mechanics and of our artillerists. I have no doubt I shall be told that other countries have had steel guns. They have had steel guns; we were late in the field. I remember that when I sat on the Front Opposition Bench I urged right hon. and hon. Gentlemen sitting on this Bench to furnish us with steel guns. It is a fact that it is only within the last four years that we have been able to produce the ingot which could be used for heavy steel guns. It is only four years ago that the largest ingot of steel which was used for a steel gun was the 20-ton ingot manufactured by Messrs. Whitworth. Our knowledge we have obtained by hard-earned experiences, by experiences which have, at times, resulted in failure; and I am not prepared to say offhand that because these gentlemen have not been successful in acquiring steel without a flaw, in foreseeing the strain which would be put upon a gun by slow-burning powder in place of quick-burning powder—I am not prepared to say that on these grounds these gentlemen are to be dismissed as not fit to serve Her Majesty. I think it may turn out that they have, by their services, entitled themselves to the gratitude of the country. My hon. Friend also asked a number of questions about the Nordenfelt gun, among others whether it was wise to allow the barrels to be made at Woolwich? I am not prepared to give an answer to that question, but I believe the decision was taken in good faith. It was a matter in which it was exceedingly necessary that there should be no delay, and the War Department were anxious to get the gun as quickly as they could. It was a patented gun, and they were willing to get the assistance of Mr. Nordenfelt, which resulted in the opposition described. I am not responsible for it—I state the fact openly in the House, and I am sure those who preceded me in Office will be ready to give a good answer on the subject if they are questioned upon it. Then, with regard to a new rifle, I have to say that it had been the subject of careful examination by a Committee of officers—not of the War Department, but officers supposed to have most experience in regard to small arms—their adaptability for purposes of offence, &c. — for four or five years before it was finally adopted. It is said that there have been some alterations in the pattern. There have been none that I am aware of; but, as the hon. Member for Hanley stated, 1,000 stands have been issued for experimental service. The Reports on the subject which have come home will be considered by the Commander-in-Chief and the Adjutant General, and then the Committee will be asked to consider their Report, and to say whether any, and, if so, what, alterations are required in the arm before it is taken into the Service. Here, again, I may repeat that I shall be glad of any suggestions which may be made to me, with a view to improving this or any arm in the Service that it may be intended to adopt, or that may be in course of construction. I am asked by my hon. Friend whether it is open to manufacturers to tender rifles to us of their invention. It is not only open to them, but we invite them to do so, as we are most anxious to avail ourselves of the economical processes and perfections of the weapon which the experience and engineering and mechanical skill of the country can produce for us. But, unhappily, as the hon. Gentleman has said, there are few persons who will devote themselves in this country to the manufacture of warlike stores. It is a small trade in this country; and, though I believe that Woolwich has rendered good service, I exceedingly regret that so much of the work is necessarily done at Woolwich, Enfield, and other Government establishments, and that thus we are deprived of the advantages of the competition of the mechanical skill of the country which we ought to enjoy. Reference has been made to guns for the Navy. I confess I am surprised to hear the remarks on this subject of some hon. Gentlemen who ought to be better informed. No gun has been adopted for the Navy which has not been sanctioned by the First Lord of the

Admiralty for the time being, and the Director General of Naval Ordnance, who is responsible for every gun taken into the Service, and who has the assistance of a Vice Admiral and two competent officers who are members of the Ordnance Committee to advise him as to all the changes that are going forward. So that, at the present day, the Admiralty is virtually responsible for every gun now on board Her Majesty's ships. The hon. Gentleman asks—"Is not the Government prepared to go beyond that?" I agree with all that has been said about making the Navy alone responsible for its own munitions of war. I have urged that in and out of Office for a very long time, and have been consistent in the view I have entertained; and I hope, with the assistance of my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), who is all-powerful in matters of this kind, that we shall obtain the consent of the Treasury to the proposed change, and that for the future the responsibility will rest with the Navy for the supply of all material of every kind which is required in its own branch of the Service. They may go to Woolwich for such guns as Woolwich may supply, or to the Whitworth Company for such as they can purchase from that firm; for they will have a perfectly free hand. Speaking on behalf of the Army, I would say that we have no reason to regret the liberty which such a course will afford us, and, besides, it will be a business-like change for the better which ought to have been made years ago. It is unreasonable that one Department should have a checking and controlling voice over the armaments of another Department. The War Office does not gain by the influence it exercises. Besides, the whole service of the manufacturing Departments of the Army will be as completely and thoroughly at the disposal of the Navy in the altered circumstances—which I hope will very soon take effect—as they have been in the past. There will be no jealousy; but, on the contrary, there will be every disposition to give the Navy our hearty co-operation in enabling them to furnish themselves with the very best guns they can obtain. I will not follow hon. Gentlemen who have spoken into all the points they have touched upon. It has been a cross fire. Some hon. Gentlemen have answered each other. I dare say the information which I have given on the part of the Government may have some effect on the course of the discussion. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Devonport (Captain Price) spoke of a "gun ring" between the War Office, Woolwich, and Elswick. I wish the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and other Gentlemen who may entertain any views of that kind, would satisfy themselves as to the facts of the case. If they would go into the actual condition of affairs—if they would only plod through papers and documents—they would find that we had occasion to complain, some little time ago, that there was jealousy between Woolwich and Elswick, and that there were complaints made in this House and out of it that Elswick did not get its fair proportion of orders, and that Woolwich was anxious to keep back from Elswick information which its own experience enabled it to obtain, lest it should be in some way injured. I believe these statements were just as baseless as those about the "tripartite alliance" or co-partnerships which is supposed to exist at the present time. But this I will say—if any Gentleman in this House or out of it will convey to me information or facts of any kind, showing the existence of any unholy alliance such as has been suggested, I shall be most grateful for the information, and most thankful for the opportunity he will give me to render service to the country. It was said, I think, that Mr. Krupp was badly treated; but that was not the case. It is going into a very old story; but the facts are these. Mr. Krupp came here some years ago and offered a gun for trial at Shoeburyness, if the Government would give him an order for £2,000,000 worth of ammunition and guns in the event of the gun being successful. Well, that was rather a large order; and, much as I admire Mr. Krupp, who is a very able man of business, much as I acknowledge his success as a manufacturer of guns, still I think the Government of the day were not wrong in refusing to enter blindly into a proposal of that kind.

CAPTAIN PRICE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman are we to understand that Mr. Krupp declined to make guns for this country unless he received orders to the extent of £2,000,000?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I never said that. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said that Mr. Krupp was badly treated, and that we declined to try a gun which he offered us for that purpose. The fact was that he offered a gun on certain conditions, one of them being that there was to be a very large order given to him.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): If the gun succeeded.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Yes, if the gun succeeded. As to the carts used in 1881, there, again, we have gained experience. I admit that the carts at that time were not of a proper character. The circumstances now have greatly changed, and it is perhaps fortunate sometimes that events happen in the Service which enable us to realize our own great defects. I admit, to the fullest extent, what the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) stated.

MR. BRADLAUGH: What I said was that the rotten harness caused a loss of the rations and medicines which were needed by the men in time of action, but which did not arrive until after the necessity for them was over.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I admit that the evidence given before the Committee bore out the statement the hon. Gentleman made. All I can say is this—that I will take good care, and the country, I am sure, will take good care, that no such circumstances shall arise again. The hon. and gallant Member for Eastbourne (Admiral Field) complained that Captain Fisher, of the *Excellent*, was not put on the Committee of Inquiry to which he referred. Well, it has not been the custom for one Department of the Service to nominate an officer of another Department on a Committee of this kind; but I believe application in the matter was made to the heads of the Departments, who declined to nominate another naval officer, believing that they had in that one already appointed a person capable of fully representing his branch of the Service. I must apologize for troubling the Committee at such great length; but I am anxious to reassure hon. Members of the sincerity of my desire to act in these matters in perfect good faith. In conclusion, I may say I do not believe I am mistaken or deceived in the perfect honour and integrity of the officers who are serving under me at the War Office at the present time. I am bound to say that, in the strongest and most emphatic terms, I believe that they are doing good service to the State, and that they are giving stores of their information, of their skill, and of their observation to the State, which information and knowledge, if given to private manufacturing firms, would insure them an enormously increased annual remuneration. We have evidence of that. To our knowledge, when gentlemen of perfect honour and character have carried their abilities and information into the arena of commercial life, they have succeeded in a marvellous manner when compared with the comparatively small pittance which they received in the Government Service. I shall continue to believe in their integrity and honour and in their absolute impartiality, until I have evidence to the contrary; and I challenge hon. Gentleman and the world to bring to me evidence which will impugn their honour and their character.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I rise to make, with the indulgence of the Committee, a short personal explanation. The hon. Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) has made a very serious charge relating to the appointment of an official at the Admiralty. I rose to Order when the hon. Gentleman spoke, for when hon. Gentlemen make a charge against the officials of the Admiralty, it seems to me only fair that the Representative of that Department should have an opportunity of replying to that charge, which, under ordinary Rules, it would be out of Order for him to do. Perhaps I may be permitted, under the circumstances, to say what the facts were. Last year the naval designer, Sir Nathaniel Barnaby, placed his resignation in my hands. I took an opportunity of consulting two or three gentleman in confidence as to the best person to succeed Sir Nathaniel Barnaby. On that all-important point I was informed by these gentlemen, who came to a unanimous opinion, that Mr. White, the naval designer of Sir William Armstrong's firm, was the person best qualified to fill the vacant office. I opened negotiations with the Armstrong Company, and with Mr. White, who was in receipt of a far larger income than he would have at the Admiralty.

Sir William Armstrong and his Directors were most reluctant to part with Mr. White, as they attached great value to his services in connection with certain ships which were then being built by the firm, and with other work. As, however, it was a question of national importance, they consented to give him up, and all the pecuniary relations between Mr. White and the Armstrong Company were terminated. Sir William Armstrong, however, asked that, during the remainder of the period in which Mr. White had contracted to serve the firm, they might consult him, on the understanding that no such consultations should interfere with his duties or be inconsistent with the position which he occupied at the Admiralty. That was the arrangement made, and I think it was, therefore, not quite fair for the hon. Member to make the remarks he did upon this matter.

SIR EDWARD REED: I rise to make a personal explanation. I think I may be allowed to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that any further explanation is necessary. The noble Lord has now replied, and both sides have been stated to the Committee.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth): As regards the charges of corruption which have been referred to, until they are made specifically and have been proved, I, for one, shall refuse to give them credence. But I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) has left the subject of the bursting of the gun on board the *Collingwood* in a most unsatisfactory condition. When a gun of this kind bursts on board a vessel, we naturally want to know distinctly the reason why it has burst. I, myself, have asked questions on the subject of Ministers on both sides of the House from time to time, and I have been told that a Committee has been appointed to inquire into the matter. I am told that the Report of that Committee is prepared, but is not yet circulated. But we have had descriptions of it from hon. Members, and I gather from these descriptions that, although certain points have been dealt with in the Report, there is one most important matter that the Committee have omitted to deal with. We may sum up that Report from the descriptions we have heard of it, by saying the gun burst in consequence of bad material having been employed — having been ill-employed — and because, through bad material having been employed, and ill-employed, it was unable to stand the strain it was required to stand. But there is another very important matter which the Committee did not deal with, and that is the twist, and the increasing twist, in the rifling of the gun. So far as I have been informed, I believe that all the guns that have burst have been constructed with an increasing twist. The effect of that increased twist is, of course, to impart a greater amount of spin to the shot as it leaves the gun. That is the object of increasing the twist. But, on the other hand, the effect of increasing the twist is to increase the liability of the shot to jam in the rifling, as it goes down the gun, and the point at which it would be likely to jam would probably not be far from the point at which the *Collingwood* gun burst. Now, that effect would be still more increased by this slow-burning powder which is used. When that powder is fired, it burns more and more as the shot goes down the gun, and the velocity of the shot goes on increasing, and also its twist up to a certain point, and its liability to jam. Such a result it is not unreasonable to expect under such circumstances as were produced on board the *Thunderer*. It was urged that that accident was due to the gun having been double-shotted; but that I do not credit, and, I believe, that the gun burst through the shot jamming in the rifling. I think this question of twist is one that should have been referred to the Committee. I asked the right hon. Gentleman the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), in this House, specially to refer that point to the Committee, and he promised to do so. He, however, failed to carry out his promise, or, at any rate, the Committee failed to take any notice of the point. In my opinion, their Report is worth very little until they have dealt with that part of the subject. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) does not, I think, quite understand the dissatisfaction which some of us feel at the constitution of the Committee. They have made their Report; it is a Report by officers, eminent engineers, and gentlemen who have all been more or less mixed up with the designing and manufacture of these guns. Now, there is one golden rule in all these matters—namely, that if there is a failure to be inquired into, it should be inquired into by entirely independent people who have had nothing to do with the construction of that which has failed. Therefore, I think this inquiry ought to have been conducted by other than those who had anything to do with the design or manufacture of these guns. My right hon. Friend says that there are no other people in the country to whom we could apply for information about guns, and to whom we could commit this question of guns, or, in fact, who understand anything about guns, than the gentlemen who composed this Committee. He would have us believe that they had been chosen on the principle of natural selection. Well, Sir, I venture to put it to hon. Members that the Committee were appointed entirely on a principle of unnatural selection, and those who are acquainted with the history of the way in which Sir William Armstrong commenced to make guns—of the alliance between him and the War Department, of the facilities and money afforded to him, and the encouragement extended to him, enabling him to make a large fortune, to set up his enormous establishment, and to obtain orders from Foreign Powers—will, I think, believe, and believe firmly and rightly, and nothing will induce them to accept a contrary view, that there has been an alliance between the War Department and Elswick, such as has not conduced to the benefit of this country. I say such as has not conduced to the benefit of this country, because it has narrowed the channel and reduced us to this—that there are too few people in the country who have had experience in the manufacture of guns. I know very well what inventors are, and how much trouble they very often give. My 23 years as a Government official gave me about as large an acquaintance as anyone with these gentlemen. I have been compelled to discuss matters with them for hours together, and I know that comparatively few of them have anything good to suggest, and they are sometimes very obstinate people, insisting upon the value and certainty of their theories, however wrong in principle. But, though I know what mere inventors are as a class, I do not agree that there are not other talented and practical designers and manufacturers in the country who could turn their attention to the question of guns, save those the Government have associated with them. If I wanted to procure good guns for the country to-morrow, I should offer a prize, and a very handsome prize, to anyone who would design and manufacture the best guns to accomplish specified objects for the good of the Service; and I believe that in that way you would bring in others than Sir William Armstrong, or Sir Joseph Whitworth, or their firms, who would give you good advice. This country is not deficient in talent or mechanical genius, or anything else, if only you give free scope to it. But, in this matter of guns, you have been in a narrow channel throughout, and it is because you have been in a narrow channel that our defences are now in such a deplorable condition. What is our position? Why, our engineers are unable to build forts, our naval constructors are unable to build ships, because you cannot give them the guns wherewith to arm them. Another cause of the unfortunate state of things which prevails is, that those Gentlemen on both sides of the House who have filled the position of Secretary of State for War—two of them were sitting on the Front Bench opposite to-night, and one was sitting on the Front Bench below me—when Questions have been put to them, have devoted more ingenuity in finding plausible answers, than they have ever exercised in the attempt to thoroughly appreciate the condition of things which has led to those Questions being put. We must all admit the ability with which the ex-Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Woodall) smoothed over all difficulties, and made us fancy that, possibly, all our ideas were wrong, and strove to make everything pleasant all round. For my own part, I can say that I have never listened to anything better, in its way, of extreme optimism, than the speech of the hon. Gentleman. But that is not the way to bring about improvement. I hope that the Government will now look our defects fairly in the face, and set to work in such a manner that we shall be able to place guns in all our ships and forts, with which we can more confidently ask our soldiers and sailors to meet an enemy.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT: Sir, I am satisfied with the announcement that has been made by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War, and therefore desire, with the consent of the Committee, to withdraw my Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MR. R. W. DUFF (Banffshire): I should like to say a few words on this Vote with regard to those who have come in for a share of blame. I understood the Secretary of State for War to say the late Board of Admiralty were not free from blame in this matter. It is true that the Admiralty were, to a certain extent, answerable for the design of guns.

MR. W. H. SMITH: What I said was that the Admiralty is responsible for the design of the guns, not for their manufacture. I never intended to convey that they were responsible for both those two distinct points.

MR. R. W. DUFF: I quite understand the right hon. Gentleman; but I certainly understood him to blame the Admiralty. It was certainly not the view of the late First Lord of the Admiralty that the Admiralty were responsible. Of course, the Admiralty cannot be responsible for guns made at Woolwich, having no control whatever over that Department. I have heard with pleasure what has been said by the Secretary of State for War as to the change with respect to naval ordnance. It is quite illogical that the Admiralty should not order their own guns as well as their own carriages; and that was distinctly the view of the late Board of Admiralty, and I am glad that it is intended that there should be a continuity of policy. I am certain that there has been a deal of friction caused between the two Departments in consequence of the Admiralty getting the carriages and the War Office the guns. I remember that the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford) made a speech in which he advocated this principle now to be adopted, and I am glad that he has a responsible position in the Admiralty Department, because, now, effect will be given to principles he previously advocated. I think my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Eastbourne (Admiral Field) went a little too far when he said that the men in the Navy had lost all confidence in these guns, and that he has rather confused the question of the guns that will be on board the *Collingwood* very shortly. What happened was this. The late First Lord had a conversation with a distinguished officer, who recommended that the other guns should be chase-hooped; but the next day he had an interview with my right hon. Friend the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), and he said that instead of chase-hooping these guns he would prefer a gun of a more approved type, originally intended for land service. The trunnions were being taken off the guns, and I believe that when these guns are placed on board the *Collingwood* they will be guns in which the men will have confidence. I do not think my hon. and gallant Friend would say anything which would cause alarm to the men in the Navy; but I wish to say that the late Board of Admiralty took every possible precaution to get the best guns they could from the War Department, and that the guns it is now proposed to mount on board the *Collingwood* will be the best guns afloat. As the Representative of the late Board of Admiralty, I wish to state that we took every possible pains to secure the best guns for the Naval Service, and I am glad to hear that we are at last about to give the Naval Department power to go into the market and get the best guns they can for themselves. I think that will be a great improvement. The late Board were about to appoint a Committee, and the Admiralty and the War Office had agreed as to the scope of inquiry; the question was as to what the Reference to that Committee should be. Upon this point there was some difference between the Departments. The Admiralty agreed that the Committee should be appointed, but no agreement was arrived at as to the Reference. I should be glad to know whether that question has been settled? The difficulty as to the Reference arose with the Treasury, and I should like to hear that that point has now been arranged.

MR. MOLLOY (King's County, Birr): Sir, with regard to this question, I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War could have made any other answer than he has made, because I think he is properly bound to defend those with whom he is associated, and if I were in his place I would do the same. The right hon. Gentleman, however, made one or two mistakes in the course of his remarks upon this subject. He challenged me to bring forward evidence of the charges made. When I stated the case, I said that I did so simply on public grounds, and that it was notorious at the present time; I said that personally I had no knowledge of the matter, and that I did not know the names of those who were associated with these charges. I do not suppose that the charges were directed against those gentlemen whose names he read out. The charges I made were specific and connected with contracts. Although I admit the right hon. Gentleman has made the best answer he could under the circumstances, I do not think that the answer which he has made is entirely satisfactory; because, rightly or wrongly, the public have it in their mind that scandals exist. Currency has been given in some degree to charges connected with private establishments which cannot be passed over without notice being taken of them. I pointed out that not only was it a question of convicting the guilty of impropriety, but that in justice to those in control of the Department I thought the Government were bound to have an investigation, either to convict the guilty, if guilty, or to defend the innocent. I do not therefore think that the public will be satisfied with the answer of the right hon. Gentleman. One word about another matter—I do not wish to be mixed up in this question, and I simply made the statement on public grounds upon the allegations contained in the public Press. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) drew attention to the point with regard to the harness used in Egypt. The excuses for the condition in which this was found to be was that it had been in store for some time; but I would point out that those who know anything about harness, have the idea that it rather improves than otherwise by remaining in store. But the fact is, that it was an inferior article that was purchased, whether from wrong motives or otherwise I do not say. It is an easy thing, in order to save a few pounds, to purchase an inferior article; but it is not a small thing, because the most important results may depend upon it. There is one cause which underlies all these matters — it is red-tapism from beginning to end.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, S.W., Ince): It is very important, when we see that some of the Great Powers are adopting magazine rifles or repeating arms of some kind, to ascertain what is the position of this country with regard to our armaments. Anyone who recollects the Campaign of 1866 will remember that when the breech-loader was introduced it gave a decided advantage to the nation which was armed with it, and England was the only Great Power which was not taken by surprise at the time. A Committee, of which Sir David Russell was President, had inquired into the subject, and the result was that it had been decided to adopt a breech-loading armament before the War of 1866 had demonstrated the absolute necessity for its adoption. Sir, I want the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to see that this country shall not be behindhand in adopting an arm which has been partially adopted by other nations; because, if one nation adopts a good repeating arm, depend upon it all other Powers have to follow suit. Now, with reference to these large guns. Having been a friend of the late Sir William Palliser, I recollect the difficulties which he underwent in connection with his inventions. There was at that time no suspicion of peculation, nor do I believe there is any foundation for such a suspicion now, but there was an idea that inventions were not treated with impartiality; and that is one of the things which we have now to look to. We must be sure that we have upon the Ordnance Committee no man whose judgment is warped by his own invention or prejudiced against the inventions of others. I admit that it is difficult to get men who are not interested in some particular form of invention; but we must be perfectly sure that that is not the case with regard to the members of our Ordnance Committee With reference to the chase-hooping of the guns, it will be recollected that Sir William Palliser strengthened the cast-iron ordnance in this country by inserting a steel interior tube; and I venture to think that that principle would be found to be stronger than exterior hoops. It is true that the diameter of the gun has to be sacrificed in this mode of treatment by the insertion of the tube; but I know that Sir William Palliser consulted some of the best mathematical authorities, who were satisfied that this plan gave the greatest amount of strength. To my mind, I think it would be better for us to introduce a naval element into the Manufacturing Department at Woolwich; because it is even more important to have the very best guns in the Navy than in the Army. We have some competent naval officers, of the *Excellent* school, and I cannot see why the Manufacturing Department at Woolwich should not have a naval element associated with it. This is a subject which I sincerely trust the right hon. Gentleman will take into serious consideration; because, in the matter of armaments, this country is very apt to go from one extreme to another.

Mr. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee): We are aware that great and grave charges have been made against the Ordnance Department; and, in answer to a Question put by myself and other hon. Members, the right hon. Gentleman stated that, in view of the confidential character of the subject, he would submit the communications sent to him to the Law Officers of the Crown and be guided by them as to the proceedings it might be advisable to take. Now, Sir, statements have been made in newspapers as to certain confidential communications which have been made to the right hon. Gentleman, and the question I have to ask is this—Have such communications been made to the right hon. Gentleman; and, if so, what action has he decided to take? I should like to receive a clear answer from the right hon. Gentleman on this subject. I would also ask the nature of those communications? I am aware that such communications would be treated as confidential; but there is a limit to a promise of that kind, and, therefore, I shall be glad to know the nature of the evidence submitted to him, and the course he intends to take? I am sure that this further information would add to the general reassuring character of the answer he has given this evening.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): Before my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) replies to the hon. Member who has just spoken, I should wish to make a few observations with reference to the speech of the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County (Mr. Molloy); and I think it is desirable that this matter should be clearly understood, as I have been associated with my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General in advising my right hon. Friend as to the course to be taken. I agree with every word which my right hon. Friend has said to-night. It has been stated more than once in the public papers that the Law Officers of the Crown have decided that the charges have not been substantiated. It shows how little those who write these statements in the Press understand the matter. The simple fact is, that the charges have not been made. It is easy to say that persons have been receiving commissions, or have been guilty of corruption, or of conspiracy. Anyone would imagine that the law of England was incapable of dealing with such crimes; but the fact is, that if an instance were brought before the Secretary of State for War of an official of the Government having been bribed, or having received commissions corruptly, the law is perfectly competent to deal with cases of the kind; and I am satisfied that the Secretary of State for War would be about the last man who would hesitate to expose any case brought before him. It is not because gentlemen in the public Press make general charges, giving no dates, giving no names or particulars, against men who have been in the Public Service for 10, 15, and 20 years, that Officers of State can act. Before they are put on their trial at all there must be something approaching a *primâ facie* case. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War stated more than once to-night that, if anybody would bring before him not proof, but what he properly called a *primâ facie* case—that is to say, dates, incidents, and persons—he would not hesitate to bring to light any transaction, whatever it might be. But we certainly protest against its being suggested that we should endeavour to get information by promising to screen the very persons who are supposed to be culprits. With regard to the instance quoted by the hon. Member (Mr. Molloy), probably the hon. Member has not refreshed his memory by referring to the record of the facts. In that particular instance, I wish to point out that the particular charge of misconduct was stated in detail in the House of Commons; names were given and dates also, and it was upon that a Committee was appointed. The hon. and gallant Member for Rochester (Colonel Hughes-Hallett) said that it rested upon the Government to prove that the present charges are without foundation. But it is absolutely impossible to prove that they are without foundation, when all that is brought forward are vague and general statements. I can only say that I feel quite as strongly as hon. Gentlemen opposite the duty of those representing the Executive Government to search into and probe to the bottom any charge brought against a Public Department, or any public official; but we cannot lend any countenance to vague statements. It is the duty of those who have charge of the public interests to see that something like a *primâ facie* case is laid down before they can act. As I have said, the law is perfectly competent to deal with bribery, corruption, or conspiracy, and, indeed, with any misconduct of the kind; and I am convinced that if grounds were shown Her Majesty's Government would not hesitate for one moment to put the law into force.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, South-East): Sir, as a Cavalry officer, I wish to refer to a Question which, some days ago, I ventured to put to the Surveyor General of Ordnance with reference to supplies, the answer which I received not being absolutely correct. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) has stated that the saddles were issued experimentally; but, Sir, I cannot think the issue of 3,000 saddles could be regarded in the light of experiment, and, therefore, I cannot admit that the explanation is satisfactory. A great many of the saddles were not used, because they fell to pieces through bad manufacture, and were, therefore, utterly useless. Of the large number of saddles issued to the Dragoon Guards four months ago, about 400 saddles were returned as useless, on account of the scandalous workmanship and manufacture. The nails, which ought to have been made of steel, were of the commonest cast-iron; and the screws, instead of being screwed in, were driven in with hammers. I wish to point out that one of the Inspectors who passed these had been in the employ of the contractor by whom those saddles were made. Taking into consideration also what the hon. Member opposite calls the more or less faulty construction of the swords issued to another regiment, I hope the Committee will not think that I have unnecessarily called their attention to the subject.

MR. E. ROBERTSON: The right hon. Gentleman has not replied to the question which I asked. I wish to know whether any certain confidential communications have been made to the right hon. Gentleman?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I have received two communications, both of which were referred to the Law Officers, and which, in the judgment of the Law Officers, did not contain anything with which I could deal. We require full information, dates, names, and circumstances, and of this the writers were informed. In one case only have I received an answer to the effect that the information would not be furnished to me, or to anyone else, unless a Royal Commission or other tribunal was appointed, having power to exonerate the guilty parties. I will not, however, be a party to exonerating any of the guilty parties. It is in that position I now stand, and I still invite communications being made to me with regard to any individuals. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Blundell) has referred to the question of guns. As I understand it, no alterations in the external fittings of the guns will be necessary. The 14 chase-hooped guns will be taken from the Navy and used for land purposes. The Navy will receive guns of a new design and of a much stronger character, and which will not be chase-hooped. My hon. and gallant Friend also spoke of the magazine rifle. A new magazine rifle is in course of construction, which it is intended to try exhaustively with a view to its introduction into the Service.

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM (Hants, Fareham): Mr. Courtney, I had intended to make some observations in reply to the statement made by the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) in answer to a Question put to him last week by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for South-East Essex (Major Rasch). I think the hon. Gentleman's observations were more favourable to the Ordnance Manufacturing Department than was altogether warranted by the facts of the case. He attributed the failure of the new saddles to the pattern; but I, as the officer who is mainly responsible for the pattern of the new saddles, attribute the failure chiefly to the manufacturers themselves. I do not, however, intend to trouble the Committee with any lengthened observations on the subject, because I am perfectly content to refer the question to the independent Committee which the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) has promised to appoint to inquire into such matters. But while the Surveyor General attributes the failure of the new saddlery to a defective pattern, I, on the other hand, attribute it to bad manufacture, to bad supervision, and to a thoroughly and hopelessly incompetent Inspector of Saddlery.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The discussion upon this Vote has already lasted so long that I think it will be convenient to the Committee that I should compress my remarks in the briefest possible space. With regard to the remarks made by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Fareham (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram), and my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South-East Essex (Major Rasch), I have to say that, concerning the new saddlery, there is a distinct conflict of testimony. My hon. and gallant Friends say that the fault lies with the contractor, while the Department attribute it to the design or pattern. Under these circumstances, I have consulted my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State, and he and I think it would be convenient and proper that a Committee of Inquiry should be held, before which the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for South-East Essex will have an opportunity of proving the statements he has made. Then, a point was raised by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Rochester (Colonel Hughes-Hallett) with respect to the Nordenfelt guns. I must remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman and the Committee that only the barrels—and by barrels I had intended, when answering a previous Question, to include jackets—are made at Woolwich, the remaining portions of the mechanism—the sights, carriage, and elevating gear, &c., being made elsewhere. A heavy royalty has to be paid to the contractor; indeed, I do not deny that Mr. Nordenfelt does make a good profit out of his gun. Of course, if the War Office buy a gun on which there is a royalty, they must pay the royalty. I am not personally responsible for the transaction. There is one other point which has been commented upon a good deal in the Press, and that is the failure of the swords of the 2nd Dragoon Guards. Some Questions have been asked me on the point, and I have had the most careful inquiry made at the War Office in regard to the matter. All that I can ascertain is, that in the early part of 1885 two swords were reported as broken; one was broken by being jammed the wrong way into the scabbard, and the other was broken in striking against another sword. The two swords were tested, and condemned as bad, and the swords of the regiment were subjected to an examination similar to that applied to the weapons of other Cavalry regiments. Undoubtedly, a very large number of the swords proved bad; they were condemned, and replaced by better weapons. Just before the regiment proceeded to India, in the autumn, the India Office thought they would like the men to be armed with the new Enfield weapon, and they were accordingly served out. That is all the information I have got. I am sure it cannot be said that I have concealed any facts from the Committee. The statement of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War has dealt, as far as is possible, with the different items of this Vote; and, considering that in that statement he promises the appointment of a Committee—a Committee which will have large powers, and be able to make very full and searching investigations into the alleged deficiencies of the War Office—I venture to express the hope that the Committee will see its way now to pass the Vote.

GENERAL FRASER (Lambeth, N.): One word only have I to say with regard to the swords. It is beyond doubt that the swords of 1882 were far from what they ought to have been—the question of whether they were over or under-tempered, is a question of the past—but the sword of 1885 is good. I hope that the swords that will henceforth be supplied will conform to the required standard. I have had some considerable experience, and I can, with truth, say that the English blades are appreciated in India. I know that one firm in this country is making 2,000 blades for India. After what has happened, I trust the Secretary of State will prevent any future contract being taken out of the country.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Mr. Courtney, the observations I wish to address to the Committee will not occupy many minutes. In one respect the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) was, I think, eminently satisfactory. He has shown that he is capable of defending the reputation and position of the officials of distinction and experience in the Department over which he presides, and they must certainly feel that whatever charges, anonymously or otherwise, are made against them while he is at the head of the War Office, they have in him, at any rate, a man who will stand between them and any unfair insinuations. But, Sir, at the same time, it will be generally felt, I think, to be a matter of very great regret that the charges which have been whispered in all directions now for some months past have not been either established or disproved. I regret this, not in the interest of the gentleman who is so assiduous in disseminating them, but in the interest of many officers who are in delicate official positions, who cannot defend themselves personally, and who, perhaps, without the least demerit on their own part, are open to all kinds of suspicions and insinuations and whisperings which are of the most painful character. Under these circumstances, it is a matter of regret that Colonel Hope's charges cannot be met, and either established or disproved. With regard to the public aspect of the question, as to the efficiency of the guns in the Public Service, it is a matter of congratulation that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War has decided to appoint a Committee, not of a Departmental character, but one which can be fully trusted to deal impartially with the whole question, and investigate everything from an independent point of view. There is one point upon which I should like to ask a question. It is in reference to the change of system which has been resolved upon with regard to then aval ordnance. I understand from the Secretary of State that, hereafter, the Admiralty is to be in a position to go where it will for its guns, to buy its guns either from the War Department or from any other institution capable of supplying them. The question I desire to ask is, What will be the immediate effect of the alteration upon the Army Estimates and upon the Navy Estimates? It seems to me that there ought to be some economical effect on the Army Estimates, but that, on the other hand, there will, in all probability, be some addition made to the Navy Estimates. I am afraid that, however small that addition may be in the immediate future, there is a very great possibility of the ideas of the Admiralty, in the more remote future, extending very considerably, and that we shall have possibly an application for a second Ordnance Committee—a Naval Ordnance Committee—so that the economical effect for the country generally may be of a very doubtful character. On this point I hope the right hon. Gentleman opposite may be able to enlighten us.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) must recollect that the Government have been in Office but a very short time, and therefore it is impossible for them to state in any amount of detail the exact nature of the change which they hope to be in a position to carry out. The exact financial effect of it will be, at any rate from my point of view, that the country will know exactly what the Navy costs, and exactly what the Army costs, and the same check will be imposed upon the Navy with regard to ordnance as is now imposed upon the Army by the Treasury. The only difference will be that the Navy will be responsible for the whole of its expenditure, and in no circumstances will it be able to shift that responsibility upon another Department.

I do not wish the hon. Member to suppose that so large a change as that can be carried out, except after the lapse of some reasonable time; nor do I think the hon. Member will press the Government for details as to the exact manner in which it will be carried out.

Mr. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN (Stirling): I am entirely in favour of the change which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) has announced; and I may say that while I was Secretary to the Admiralty I succeeded in transferring to the Admiralty Vote the charge for gun-carriages, which was a considerable step in the direction of the proposed change, so that I have given proof of the sincerity of my desire to see an alteration effected. I am bound to say there is some ground for the fear just expressed by the hon. Member below the Gangway (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), because, unless the matter is closely watched, there may be a tendency on the part of each Department to create an Ordnance business of its own, and there will no longer be the complete security there is at present for the interchangeability of stores or arms which, being obsolete for one Service, may yet be available for the other. But, after all, that is a small matter compared with the great object of securing the direct responsibility of the Admiralty for the armament of the Navy. From the point of view of the Army, it is most desirable that the Army Estimates should be relieved of this very great charge which the Navy ordnance entails. Well, Sir, the announcement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry is also very satisfactory. It is possible there may be more truth than we think there is in some of these accusations brought against the manner in which the Departments have been conducted; and it is necessary to inspire not only the country, but the two Services, with perfect confidence in the guns which the latter have to use. It is one of the traditions remaining in the minds of all who have watched these matters, how much we suffer from the scare which occurred a few years ago when a breech-loading gun was issued in large numbers to the Navy, and, owing to some accident, failed to secure the confidence of officers and men of the Fleet. The result was, that all that had been done had to be undone, and that enormous expenditure was incurred without any advantage whatever. Now, the first condition is, that however we obtain our guns, or materials of war, the men who use them should have confidence in them; and if there is any idea in the minds of the officers and men of the Navy that they are not used well in this respect, surely it is most desirable, by any means in our power, to remove that apprehension or impression. It is a very large subject with a great many branches, and it is not easy to see how the inquiry can be conducted. I will now say a few words on the unpleasant subject that has been so much before us to-night—namely, the charges of corruption or malpractices on the part of the officers of the Ordnance Department. When those charges were first published in the prominent way in which they have come before the country, I was responsible for the War Department, and I have no other desire myself—and I am bound to say that the officers of the Department had no other desire—than that those charges should be investigated and refuted; but the difficulty was, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite has indicated, that there was really no foundation on which we could proceed. A vague charge of corruption, or of undue influence of certain firms, is not a matter which can be brought to the test of inquiry in the proper way. The Authorities might have appointed a Committee or a Commission to inquire into the question; but that method of procedure would not have got to the bottom of the matter. It was absolutely necessary to proceed in one of two ways—either by criminal prosecution against the offenders, or else by inducing Parliament to consent to the appointment of a Commission with the power of examining witnesses on oath, calling for the production of papers, and, what is the usual accompaniment of such power, the protection of witnesses. Now, Sir, I asked myself, how can I go to Parliament and ask it to appoint any such Commission? I should have to come to the Table of this House and say—"Mr. Speaker, I wish Parliament to assent to the appointment of a Commission with these extraordinary powers, because someone has said somewhere that some particular officials have done something which is corrupt, I know not where, when, or how." I venture to say that if the Secretary of State for War or any Minister of the Crown appealed to Parliament on such grounds, Parliament would refuse to grant the inquiry sought. I do not believe that there is any case of a Royal Commission with such powers being constituted, without, at all events, a *primâ facie* case being made out for investigation. I agree entirely with what the right hon. Gentleman said on the subject. I have the most perfect confidence in the integrity and honour of all the officers, both military and civil, who are concerned. I will say for them, that while I was at the War Office, they gave me no peace in their anxiety to have these charges brought to the test of public examination, and I endeavoured to satisfy their very natural feelings on the subject by making the explanation to them which I have just made to the Committee, and by calling upon those who made the charges and insinuations to supply me with the material on which I could base an appeal to Parliament for the powers previously mentioned. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has to-night made a similar appeal, and I trust that that appeal may be responded to, and that the alleged facts which underlie these rumours may be forthcoming, in order that satisfaction may be given, not only to the officers whose characters are assailed, but also to the public at large. But, putting aside that particular charge, there are other questions which may be inquired into with reference to the Ordnance Department. There is, first of all, the large question of the type and design of guns and other material of war. What would be done by an inquiry into that subject? We have already this Ordnance Committee. The Ordnance Committee is a body of whose constitution many who write and speak on this subject appear to be lamentably ignorant. The Ordnance Committee has nothing to do with the War Office, except that some of its members are appointed by the Secretary of State. It is a perfectly independent body; it is only a consultative body, and has no executive and administrative power whatever. All it has to do is to give independent advice to the Admiralty and the War Office on the question of armament. The members of this body ought to be the best naval and military officers available, and there are associated with them such authorities as Sir Frederick Bramwell and Mr. Barlow, who are placed on the Committee because of their intimate knowledge of metals and kindred subjects with which the Committee have to deal. But then it is said that there are added to this body members of certain great gunmaking firms. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), who was in the House during the early part of the debate, asked me, as he was unable now to be present himself, to explain to the Committee why he added these members in 1885. There was no question then of asking the Committee, so strengthened, either to reject, condemn, or approve any guns whatever. The responsibility for approving or rejecting a gun lies with the Secretary of State for War; but when the noble Marquess asked those Members of the two eminent firms to join the Committee, he told them that recent accidents in the new types of breech-loading guns had indicated the necessity of modifying, to a certain extent, their construction; and, by the direction of the Surveyor General of Ordnance, designs of existing breech-loading guns and of other guns of the future would be submitted to them. They were merely asked to examine those guns, which were of an already obsolete type, but which were believed to be serviceable, and to say whether they ought to be strengthened, in view of the experience obtained. It has been said to-night that no gentleman ought to have served on the Committee without previously resigning his connection with the firm to which he belonged; but I should like to say, as to that, that he was appointed on the Committee because he belonged to the firm. It is a most extraordinary proposal. We wish to gain the best information we can find. To whom do we go? To the gunmaking firms of the country, the rivals of Woolwich. We wish to get their assistance; we wish also that they should, for their own benefit and the benefit of the country, gain any knowledge that may be attained from the experience of what has occurred; and I certainly think that so far from requiring any justification, the action of my noble Friend, in appointing these gentlemen, was one which the Committee will undoubtedly approve. In the course of time a certain gun met with an accident. This gun, having been approved and passed into the Service by this Committee, the chase exploded. Then it occurred to me, as the wisest course to take, that I should summon the same gentlemen, both of the Ordnance Committee itself, and also the Associated Members, who had approved the gun for service, to meet together and see how they could account for what happened. That is the whole story of how those names happened to be associated in the matter. The Report they have made is now before the Committee, and those who have technical knowledge sufficient to enable them to understand it, may judge of it for themselves. But I wish to make it perfectly plain that this is a body independent altogether of the officials of the War Office and the Ordnance Department. It is a body, I am bound to say, on which I have always looked with some jealousy and suspicion. I was in the War Office as Financial Secretary at the time it was created, and my objection to it was that it would be a cause of expense; that an independent body of this kind would be always proposing the adoption of new inventions, and would therefore tend perhaps to the undue expenditure of money. But in this case, however, the Committee will see that they have acted exactly in the opposite direction. While they might very well have rejected what was before them, and might have caused expenditure to be laid out on the gun before it was received into the Service, they, on the contrary, admitted it; and it is only now that they recommend that the guns of that class should be chase-hooped. It was decided that no more of these guns should be used for naval purposes; but the Military Authorities, not having the same low opinion of them as is held by the Naval Authorities, believe that they will be found perfectly suitable when hooped for land service. We might further inquire into the source of supply, into the question whether we should manufacture guns ourselves, or whether we should encourage more largely than we do the independent manufacturing trades of the country. We have always endeavoured, as far as we could, to encourage the independent manufacturing trade; but I believe it is absolutely necessary to maintain an Arsenal and Manufacturing Establishment of our own at Woolwich. At the same, time it would be the greatest mistake and folly on our part if we allowed them to monopolize altogether the gunmaking business of the country; on the contrary, we should give every encouragement in our power to the creation and development of local manufactures. Then there is the further question whether the superintendence of the whole of this expenditure in the War Office is now arranged in the best way possible for the Public Service? I confess that is a point on which I have some doubts. I am not sure that the distribution of responsibility and duties in reference to the control of the Ordnance Department and the other Departments of the War Office is absolutely perfect. That, however, is a matter quite by itself, but one which might very well be taken into consideration by the right hon. Gentleman. Lastly, I come to a much smaller question, but one of great importance, as to which I myself appointed a Committee—namely, an inquiry into the Manufacturing Departments, as to whether they were economically and efficiently administered. I appointed a Committee of business men, who, I believe, have already commenced their labours; and I am sure that, whatever may be done in reference to other branches of the Service, their inquiries will be of the greatest advantage. The right hon. Gentleman now says he is going to appoint another Commission to inquire into all the complaints made as to military stores and the mode of their issue to the Service. Well, I quite agree that that is a most important thing to be inquired into. It was in my mind after the inquiry had been made into the Manufacturing Departments—that is to say, into the way in which material of war was manufactured—further to inquire into the method in which this material is stored and distributed in the Army. I trust that the further Commission the right hon. Gentleman indicates will make an exhaustive inquiry, and have an important result in pointing out the various respects in which the present system may be improved. I do not know that I have anything further to say. I can only repeat what has been said so often to-night — namely, that these charges of corruption, which are new matter and quite foreign to all the other questions of the efficiency of the Service, having been made ought to be supported with sufficient evidence, or put upon a sufficient foundation, to enable an inquiry to be made. I am confident, from my knowledge of the officers concerned, that any inquiry of this kind would only prove their perfect integrity and innocence of the charges brought against them.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) has spoken of the bursting of one particular gun; but has he any knowledge of the other accidents which have occurred to the heavy ordnance?

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): The right hon. Gentleman the late Secretary of State for War has made, as he always does make, a very sensible speech on most of the questions before us; but I do not intend to follow him through all the matters he touched upon. I will not go into this charge of corruption with which he has dealt, except to say that I do not believe in it for a moment, so far as the Heads of Departments are concerned. No doubt, there is, and always will be, the possibility of some minor official getting such a thing as a £5 note by some means which would not bear a searching scrutiny—even a large sum of money may now and then be made by an official in a transaction which, if put under a powerful microscope, might look very big. But I do not wish to talk about the officials. I should like to put before the Committee my view of the way in which all the evil that is complained of has occurred; I desire to draw the attention of the House to the very root of the matter. We must go back 15 or 16 years to find the origin of the present mistakes in our gun-making. What is the most noticeable feature in the history of English gunnery? Why, that for 10 years we adhered to muzzle-loading, when all the rest of the world had adopted the breech-loading system, and that got us into a different school of gunnery to anyone else. Since the American War there have only been three schools of gunnery in the world—the Woolwich and Elswick school, the Krupp, and the French school. There was absolutely no other school. Russia and the Germans followed Krupp; the Austrian system was partly Krupp, partly Armstrong, and partly their own; the Italian system was partly Krupp; but in this country we had strenuously refused to have anything to do with breech-loading for 10 or 12 years. The muzzle-loading system was backed up by one of the powerful Parties in the State—it was backed up, to a certain extent, by both Parties, but more strenuously by one than the other. Sir John Adye was in favour of it, and Sir John, as everyone knew, was a most clever and able officer. He was a man of very great talent, whose opinion on all military matters, save one, was of the greatest weight. Able and talented as was this officer, he had led the country in a wrong direction for a period of about 10 years, and had put the country to a useless expenditure of about £3,000,000. I took the liberty of pointing out to the House many times that the policy which was being persued in regard to the manufacture of guns was a mistaken one; but in those days there were very few Artillery officers in the House, and in the very few there were I am reckoning naval officers. That state of things, however, has passed away, and there are now many Artillery officers here. I say, I warned the Governments of years ago that they were not pursuing a sound policy in their manufacture of guns; and, modest and humble Member as I am, I must say that if my warning had been listened to, and my advice taken, a waste of about £3,000,000 would have been saved the country. You went on a different tack to the whole world—you would not take advice or example from the French or from the Germans. I admit that since 1880 the breech-loading system has had a powerful friend in the present Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith). That right hon. Gentleman asked many questions of the Military Authorities across the Table; and though, when in Office himself, he had not perhaps brought the subject of breech-loading into much prominence, hesitating to insist upon the fact that his Colleagues were wrong, I give him the credit of having long been a convert to the breech-loading system. About five or six years ago all who had supported the muzzle-loading system came to see the utter folly of their case. The evidences before them were too strong for them, and they were reluctantly compelled to yield. You may hide for a long time the fact that you are wrong by diverting attention to minor matters; but you cannot go on concealing your error for ever. Six years ago, then, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, when he went out of Office, asked many questions upon this matter. It will be remembered that he had not long occupied the position of First Lord of the Admiralty in the Government which had just gone out. He had been Secretary to the Treasury for some years, and had been promoted to the position of First Lord of the Admiralty; and it was whilst connected with this Department that he saw the desirability of changing our system of gun-making. The country began to change its views on the matter about this time. Mr. Krupp produced some magnificent guns, and we soon saw that they were far superior to our own. Then came the rush. It was officially declared by Colonel Maitland, in a lecture delivered by him, that all our own guns must be considered obsolete; but that all that was wanted to put our armaments in an efficient condition was four years' time and plenty of money. If I am not mistaken the then Secretary of State for War, the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), was present at that lecture; and I believe that when the question of money was mentioned he not only left the place himself, asking the present Secretary of State to take the Chair in his place, but took with him the Financial Secretary. A large amount of money was asked for, for the officials in the Gun Factory had to make a rush for the breech-loading system, and I do not wonder at a great many mistakes having been made as a consequence of that rush and hurry. They tried to get velocities equal to Krupp's, believing that everything that the French did was bad. With our own guns we had been reducing the velocity by some 500 feet or 600 feet, and that was a much more serious thing than having a gun burst occasionally, though the sailors may not think so. The reduction of velocity by some 500 feet or 600 feet might mean the loss of a battle, if it were to be decided by gunnery; but the bursting of a gun could have no such effect. Our Ordnance Authorities, I say, would not go to France for patterns; but they took Krupp as a guide. They wrote a letter to which the Secretary of State has alluded. I remember putting a Question in this House on the subject, and I was told that Krupp had been applied to to give us a gun; but that he had replied that he could only give us one on condition that if, having been submitted to tests, the weapon was considered satisfactory, an order should be given to him to the extent of £1,000,000. [“No, no!”] I know the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War knows better than I; I am only trusting to my memory as to what another Secretary of State said, and I may be wrong in my recollection, or that other Secretary of State may have been incorrect in his statement. I believe it is a fact that Krupp would not give a gun unless we undertook to take £1,000,000 worth or £2,000,000 worth of ordnance from him. [Captain PRICE: When was that?] It was, I think, within a year of the debate on breech-loading in this House. We refused Krupp's terms, and cut ourselves off from all sources of information—we cut ourselves off from Krupp and from the French, although we have, to some extent, since adopted the French method of breech-loading, and have borrowed something of Krupp's manner of construction. We have taken the rings which strengthen the gun from Krupp, although, in the case of the gun that burst, we had not adopted this style. Krupp seems always to have used rings in the construction of his heavy ordnance, and that appears to be a great objection; but, although it is an objection, it seems to be an essential. He always puts on a few rings. We, no doubt, committed a fault in the first instance; but I think it was only a technical fault. The hon. and gallant Admiral opposite (Sir John Commerell) says that the Navy has got into a great tantrum—and in referring to the hon. and gallant Admiral I would congratulate him upon his political views; I only wish he had shown adhesion to them by his votes in the last Parliament. It is all very well for him to hold the advanced views he does on naval matters; but it is very different with him when he comes to vote on matters of general policy. Well, he says the Navy has got into a great tantrum, and, so far as I can see, he is quite right; for the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) when he took the House of Commons, or a great part of it, to Portsmouth, found that the officers there appeared to be in a state of panic. The noble Lord and those he took with him found that the whole of our gunnery was wrong. It was found that the velocity of our guns was reduced; and, as I have said, reducing the velocity of the shot is a much more serious thing than having an occasional burst. I do not see how you can hope to compete with other nations in high velocities without having a few burstings. It is a minor matter altogether how you are going to produce these guns, and I do not see why you should not have the Krupp rings. We have something of the same kind on our Elswick guns; in fact, when I saw Krupp's guns I could not help thinking that Armstrong had taken a great deal from Krupp, and that Krupp had taken a great deal from Armstrong. I would say to the Government—"Do not neglect what foreign nations are doing at present; do not neglect to profit by what is being done in a great school like that of France." I do not say that the present Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) is neglecting what is being done by foreign nations, or that the late Secretary of State did so; but I would impress upon them that they cannot be too much on the alert in these matters. There is another point of mixed naval and military administration which has come before the House in which it appears to me that great dangers are involved, and I should like to say a word or two upon it, particularly as it has been noticed by the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman). The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out that if you separate the Army from the Navy in matters affecting ordnance you will involve the country in great expense. I will go further, and I will say that you will not only involve the country in great expense by your attempt, but that, in the long run, you will find your new system unworkable. I say have a mixed Committee, and if you will not have the naval element predominate upon it, then let the military element predominate. There can be no doubt that if there is to be a choice between the Army and Navy, the Navy should have the best guns, because our ships can go everywhere, and are of the highest importance for the defence of the country—indeed, the defence of the country depends upon them. On the other hand, there are a large number of second and third class forts, and even first class forts, which, with somewhat inferior guns, will be very formidable. If you adopt this separate system, the result will be that whenever the Navy have improved their guns, and hand the old patterns over to the Army—which they must do as a matter of necessity, because, as I say, the Navy must have the best guns, whilst the inferior ones can be put on our fortifications—the Land Service will very naturally protest against having these second-hand articles given over to them. They will refuse to take the guns; of course you will be able to force them to do so; but in this way you will put the Land Forces in the ridiculous position of not knowing what guns they are going to receive, of not being prepared for them, and not knowing how to use them, when they do receive them. I think the Navy ought to have a considerable voice in this matter of gunnery, if you like the principal or preponderating voice; but I certainly think that if you divide your Gunnery Department into two you will make a very great mistake. You must remember the complicated nature of modern artillery. You must recollect that you have not only to decide upon the pattern of the gun, but also as to the shell, the fuse, the powder, the carriage, and everything else; and in making your selection you should have in view the requirements of each Service. If you do not adopt, as far as possible, the same pattern in both Services, you will very likely go wrong. I quite think that the money which is expended on ordnance for the Navy should be put in the Navy Estimates; but, while it is an open question whether the Navy or the Army should have the preponderating voice, I do not think it would be wise to divide the Gunnery Establishment into two. Otherwise, I think that the speech we have heard from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) is a very re-assuring one. The technical matter stated by the hon. Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) that you can make your guns too long is a matter I will not go into; but I certainly was surprised to hear a man of his scientific attainments speak as he did upon this subject.

GENERAL GOLDSWORTHY (Hammersmith): Military officers generally are agreed that the Ordnance Department is not managed in the way it ought to be. Many military officers in this House, and many out of it, are far from satisfied with the management; and seeing the large amount of money which is asked for — namely, £2,500,000—I certainly think its expenditure should be in the hands of the most capable people. I agree with that which fell from the hon. and gallant Admiral the Member for Southampton (Admiral Sir John Commerell), and with what has fallen from several military Members here. I noticed just now that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War said that when complaints were made of the jamming of a cartridge or bursting of a gun or anything else, immediately a special inquiry was made into the matter. That may be true; but I ask why should we wait for accidents to occur before we take measures to ascertain the defects of our ordnance? Why should you wait until you see letters in *The Times* from their correspondents before you take steps to find out whether the cartridges supplied to the troops jam, and whether the soldier, who has to trust his life to the excellence of the weapons served out, has the very best weapon which can be produced? The country, I am sure, would be willing to pay for that weapon whatever its cost. It is not fair to the soldier to send him on foreign service to face an enemy with an inefficient weapon in his hand, nor is it right that the armaments of the country, or any of them, should be purchased from abroad. This is a great manufacturing country; there is a geat deal of distress amongst the artizan and labouring classes; there are factories closed and people at this moment starving, and in want of employment; and I, therefore, hold that any orders which it may be necessary to place for arms should be given in this country. I trust that on every hand it will be pressed on the Ordnance Department that no material should be ordered from abroad. By keeping these manufactures in our own hands we shall have this advantage—that in the event of a war breaking out we shall be able to supply what we want for ourselves, without being put to the necessity of making application to a foreign country, which might prove unable or unwilling to meet our demand. In making these remarks about the Ordnance Department I am entirely unprejudiced. I am simply speaking from a sense of duty, and because I believe that the Army has very often been sacrificed to political exigencies. I hope that the present Secretary of State for War will be allowed to remain at the head of the War Department so long as the present Government remains in power, so that at last we may have a chance of getting the deficiencies that exist in the Department rectified and put to rights.

Captain COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.): I am not going to attempt many observations at this hour of the evening; but I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the Committee any assurance that the guns which are not approved of in the Navy, and are condemned, will not be sent out to our coaling stations or Colonies? I need not give any reasons for putting this question. I am sure both the present and the late Secretary of State for War, with the correspondence they have had before them, will see the great importance to this country of not laying itself open to the imputations by our Colonies—which are erecting fortifications on their sea-boards—that we are sending inferior articles to them to arm those fortifications.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I can assure the hon. and gallant Gentleman that no material will be sent to a foreign station that is not perfect.

Mr. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Mayo, S.): I think we ought to protest against the advice given by an hon. and gallant Member to Her Majesty's Government. He recommends them to sell, or dispose of, to our friends the Turks, these guns that have been so much condemned; but I imagine it would be more desirable to dispose of them to our probable enemies the Russians. On the whole, Sir, I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves upon the result of this debate. No one can doubt that the public mind has been for a long time uneasy in regard to the subjects which have been touched on in this debate; and it is satisfactory to know that at length steps are about to be taken to put an end to the state of things which has been so much complained of. It is a very demoralizing thing that so many rumours should have been circulated, and that such grave alarms should have been created in the public mind. If it is possible, these rumours should be now dispelled—these alarms should be quieted. As to the rumours being well founded, if we only refer to the state of things which existed in France previous to the Franco-Prussian War we shall find ample evidence to convince us that when the public mind is disturbed, and no adequate measures are adopted to remove the cause of the alarm, very serious consequences may soon come about. I am sorry to say, as far as I am concerned, that our interests in this matter are very secondary; in fact, our interest is confined to the pecuniary portion of the question. Our country is, at the present time, very heavily taxed; and we cannot, therefore, afford to waste any more money. It is our interest, then, to see that this waste does not go on; because of the money that is wasted Ireland has to bear her share. We are interested to this extent besides—that the armament of the country, of which Ireland pays her share, should be properly provided for; and that interest, it is to be expected, will be greatly increased when this House takes into consideration a Home Rule Bill for Ireland, such as that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). Meantime, and until Ireland is accorded a Volunteer Force of her own, I think it is but fair that an equivalent money contribution should be made to Ireland.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £465,800, to complete the sum for Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT (Sussex, North-West): On this Vote there is one question with regard to the defence of coaling stations on which I should like to have some information. Will the right hon. Gentleman state how much money has been expended on those works? I see that only £60,000 is asked for of the sum to be expended —£300,000. This is a snbject which demands very careful consideration at the hands of Her Majesty's Government; and there is a strong desire to know what is intended to be done with regard to works which are all important to the defence of the Empire.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I may say that the amount provided for in this Vote is not so large as, if I had been responsible for the preparation of these Estimates, I should have asked Parliament to grant. I fully agree with the tenour of the remarks of my hon. and gallant Friend, and I can assure him that our object is one which I believe the late Government had also in view—namely, the completion of these works in a way that will conduce to the economical expenditure of the money voted by Parliament. It is, of course, possible that an unwise expenditure might take place by undertaking more work than it is possible to do; and, under the present circumstances, I do not think I should be justified in asking now for a larger expenditure of public money than is here provided for. To a large extent the Colonies themselves are providing for the works, while their armament is being provided by this country.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I wish to refer to an important question which has not yet been brought under the notice of the Committee—I refer to the defensive works for the completion of harbours. This subject was considered in the year before last, and we find that a certain amount of money is asked for submarine defences in connection with these harbours. The opinion is that sufficient attention is not paid to the great importance of protecting our commerce; and that fact must bring to the mind of anyone acquainted with the subject the consideration that if our commerce is not efficiently protected this country must decline. The harbours around the coasts of England, Ireland, and Scotland are in such a condition that, practically speaking, if a war were to break out to-morrow our commerce would suffer to a considerable extent. Cork Harbour is, of course, fairly well defended; the forts on both sides of the harbour being in a fair state. These forts were commenced years ago, however, and yet Fort Carlisle is unfinished. It was only a short time ago that some heavy guns intended for the fort were left for days lying alongside the pier, because there was no suitable apparatus for lifting them; and when that difficulty was got over they could not be got into the fort. I hope the Secretary of State for War will pay attention to the backward state of the defences of the port. Labour at the present time is cheap, and there is no doubt that a great deal of misery and starvation exists in these Realms; and, accordingly, there could be no more proper time in which to employ a considerable amount of labour upon works of this kind. We find that with regard to them there is a great deal of backwardness and want of diligence. We know that we are on the verge of a troubled period—that a great war might break out; that there is a disturbed state of things in the Balkan Provinces; and that, therefore, we ought to be prepared. Well, Sir, there is another part of the Harbour of Cork which is not in such a state of defence as it should be. I refer to Fort Westmoreland, commonly known as Spike Island, which it was supposed could be put in a pretty forward state in the course of 12 months, and fitted up for a battalion of Infantry. I have heard that the works are not progressing as they ought; and that the Military Authorities are taking things very easily. They are trying to tide over things, in which attempt they are assisted by the state of the weather, and by the excuse that they are changing Spike Island into a depôt for Militia, who are sent there for training, and also for the benefit of the sea air and bathing, an arrangement which, although it might be of advantage to the Militia, is not, in my opinion, to the interest of the district, or the country. I maintain that the Government should at once take this work in hand, and as soon as possible carry out the original design, which everyone is looking forward to. Then, I turn to the Harbour of Waterford. Waterford has not a very large trade, perhaps; but there is a considerable amount of commerce in connection with the locality; and we know that the harbour is thoroughly undefended. Passing to the Port of Dublin, I remark that were any of those iron-clads, which Italy and other foreign countries possess, to make the attempt, they could, without any difficulty whatever, destroy the Port of Dublin, and that is equally true with regard to the Ports of Belfast and Derry. Now, I think it is really time that Her Majesty's Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, in consideration of the large amount of money spent by the Naval and Military Departments of the State, should see that these works are carried out, and that they should not lose sight of the great importance of defending our harbours of commerce, but pursue to the utmost the policy of protecting our Commercial Navy. And not only do these remarks apply to the harbours of Ireland, but they apply with even greater force to the harbours of Great Britain. What would be the position of a great commercial city like Liverpool if a war were to break out to-morrow; and what would be the position of Glasgow or Edinburgh? I see that a certain amount of money is to be appropriated especially for the defence of the Tyne, and also a very small amount, having regard to the importance of the subject, for Ireland. Taking into consideration the state of the coast defences in Great Britain and Ireland, I feel that hon. Gentlemen will recognize the importance of this question. The South Coast of England is well provided for. But why? Because the South Coast faces the enemy. This does not apply to the West Coast and the harbours upon the West and East Coasts, which are attainable in most weathers, and are consequently readily assailable. Then I find that the amount of money granted for the defence of coaling stations is not being expended as rapidly as it ought to be. The total amount originally voted was £331,251, of which £43,750 has already been voted, and £50,000 is asked for for the present year. With regard to this, I think that the interests involved are of such importance that we ought to proceed to the expenditure of the sum originally voted on the principle that we should not make two bites of a cherry. I think this is a question that ought to be settled and brought to a termination at once, and that right hon. Gentlemen should look forward and take notice of the dangers and difficulties which might at any time beset the nation; and I am convinced that if this is done it will be not only a wise precaution in itself, but one which will be emphatically endorsed by this House and the country.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): I should be glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman as to the state of the fortifications at Hong Kong; and, further, if we have any reliable guns that we can send out there?

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): I feel some hesitation in addressing the Committee after the number of speeches which have been made in connection with these Estimates; but there is a very simple question which I should like to bring under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. I should be glad to know whether I can obtain the support of the right hon. Gentleman to the proposal for providing some recreation ground for the soldiers of the garrison of London? Perhaps the Committee will allow me to remark that the number of troops in the London garrisons is at least 5,000, and that it is the only garrison of the size that is without means of recreation. I think it is only right and fair that, as a soldier, I should urge upon the Government the desirability, the necessity, and the common sense of providing a means of recreation for British soldiers in the Metropolis. It is not my intention to go into the details of the subject; but I think I may fairly urge that a question of this sort is of interest to all concerned, not only in the welfare of this particular garrison, but also for the maintenance of order throughout the Metropolis. There are certain newspapers which seem to be ready to take every opportunity of condemning the conduct of the soldiers who form part of the garrison of the Metropolis. I think if those who make these attacks were also acquainted with the great temptations to which soldiers are exposed, and the great want of those national recreations which are the great safeguard against temptation, that they would not be so willing to withhold their approval from such a plan as I propose. I trust that it will be found to be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to provide some ground for the recreation and amusement of our soldiers, and that the proposal will receive his favourable consideration. I am quite certain, in that case, that the Army will think that they can have no more sympathetic and kind friend than the right hon. Gentleman. I venture also to express a hope that the Committee will not be backward in supporting the Secretary of State for War in carrying out a proposal which will be an act of common sense as well as fair play to the soldier.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): I think the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) will find, when my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War makes his statement to the House next year, that we have not been neglectful of the importance of the subject of the defence of commercial harbours. It is now engaging the attention of Her Majesty's Government, and the hon. Member himself has admitted that they have not been entirely idle in this respect. The work is being pursued with considerable activity at Hartlepool, Dublin, and Belfast. With regard to Hong Kong, I am informed that the works there are in an advanced state, and it is hoped that they will be ready next year, when the guns will be sent out. In reply to the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member who has just spoken, I can assure him that the question of providing a recreation ground for the troops of the garrison of London shall receive the most careful consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

DR. TANNER: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman at what time it is contemplated that the work on the Irish harbours will be proceeded with; and whether it is contemplated to employ civil labour at Fort Westmoreland?

CAPTAIN COLOMB: I did not gather from the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of the Ordnance whether the guns for the works at Hong Kong were ready, and I should be glad to have a statement upon that subject. I will also ask what progress has been made with the works at Singapore; and whether the armament will be ready by the time the works are completed?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am unable to give the exact information asked for by my hon. and gallant Friend; but he is probably aware that a certain programme was laid down for four years, and I may say that that programme will be adhered to.

DR. TANNER: I find that the amount of money to be expended on Fort Westmoreland is £3,000, while there is a sum of £5,000 for the purchase of land for a house for the officer commanding the district. I think this will show the way in which these works are being proceeded with.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am obliged to the hon. Gentleman for the manner in which he stimulates the zeal of the Department; but it will be satisfactory for him to know that the expenditure on the house for the General commanding in the district is an amount that would otherwise have to be paid.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £73,600, to complete the sum for Establishments for Military Education.

CAPTAIN SELWYN (Cambridge, Wisbech): I should like, on this Vote, to call the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War's attention to the question of the Staff College. I find that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction as to the Staff College, on account of the regimental officer being compelled to do student's duty during the term — exceeding, as a rule, two years — he is practising his studies at the Staff College. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) can, without increasing the Vote, hold out any hope that the grievance will be redressed. I have no doubt that many hon. Members present do not really understand what the grievance is. It is a grievance of the regimental officers, and they are so much concerned that, at the present time, an officer who is known to be reading for the Staff College becomes from that very fact unpopular, simply because, if he was successful, they for two years would be compelled to do his duty. Indeed, it is not only for two years that they are compelled to do this, but for the additional time, generally four months, which the officer has to spend in study with other arms. If the right hon. Gentleman can hold out any hope that the regimental officers will not be required to perform this extra duty, a great deal will be done to allay the dissatisfaction that at present exists.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR OFFICE (Mr. BRODRICK) (Surrey, Guildford): The matter to which my hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Selwyn) has referred has only now been brought to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith); but he will take care that due consideration is given to it.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I should like to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) and of the Committee to the condition of the Medical Establishment at Netley. As far as I understand, Netley is intended, first of all, as an examining body; and, secondly, as a training school, where young medical men, who enter the Army Medical Department, are fitted for the position they are afterwards to hold in the Service. I would suggest to the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee whether it would not be advisable, bearing in mind the few facts I brought to the attention of the Committee last night, to enlarge the school at Netley, with a view of making it so large as to enable the officers belonging to the Army Medical Service, who have spent a long time either abroad or in isolated districts at home, to come up and obtain fresh information concerning their Profession? We all know that in time a man gets stale as regards his Profession unless he reads in order to keep pace with the times. I would suggest that officers belonging to the Army Medical Department should, as they pass from one stage of their service to another, be obliged to return to Netley; that Netley should be made a place of general instruction for medical officers of all grades; that it should be made a great educational establishment, capable of conferring benefit upon the Profession and credit upon the country. From time to time I have heard many complaints that officers of the Army Medical Department are not afforded the facilities which, in the interest of the Army as well of themselves, ought to be afforded them. In France military surgeons are obliged from time to time to attend hospital, in order that they may ascertain what is going on in the medical world. Such is the case, too, in Germany. I have been in classes in Berlin where most of the men were members of the Army Medical Department. It does not follow that because a military surgeon might happen to be Deputy Inspector of Hospitals he is not obliged to go to Berlin and go through a course of medical training when his time comes round. The same state of things should obtain in this country. We know that when a young medical man joins the Army he knows a great deal more about his business than he does when he has been in the Service 10 years. Such a thing ought not to be. As a man grows older, he ought to be more fitted and capable to deal with the cases intrusted to his care.

That is not the case in the Army Medical Service. I challenge anyone to prove that that is the case. We have had complaints over and over again about this state of things; and I ask the military men in the House to stand up in their places and let us know whether it is not the fact, generally speaking, that if they want good medical treatment in the Army, they apply not to the old surgeon-major, but to one of the young and pushing assistant surgeons? I also wish to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that good assistant surgeons, who are able to make their mark in the Service, do not remain in it; they only stay in the Service a short time, because the advantages I have specified are not extended to them. I invite the right hon. Gentleman to examine the statistics in regard to this matter; because, if he does, he will find that all the assistant surgeons who pass first or second at Netley leave the Army in a very short time, unless they have got some other connection with the Service. I trust that the grievance may be remedied; it is not a theoretical, but a practical grievance. If you want practical men you must teach them practically. You must afford them practical instruction. Unfortunately, that is not the case. You have got a magnificent hospital at Netley; all you want to do is to enlarge it and its operations.

MR. BRODRICK: In reply to the hon. Member opposite (Dr. Tanner), I have to say that the Government are fully aware of the advantages of a course of training at Netley. A very considerable increase in the number of students has taken place, which has necessitated a slight increase in the present Vote. Beyond that, the matter has been under the consideration of the Government; and, in some respects, the information gained points to conclusions similar to those arrived at by the hon. Member. Of course, any reform in the direction which the hon. Gentleman suggests would create a very considerable charge upon the Exchequer; but my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War will, nevertheless, give the fullest possible consideration to the views of the hon. Gentleman.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £17,100, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Effective Services.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) a question with respect to Sub-head H—"Expenses arising from Prevention of Contagious Diseases." The question crops up upon the present Estimates, inasmuch as the Estimates were made up before the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. The late Government said they would deal with this matter; but I suppose they did not remain in Office long enough to take it into mature consideration. I do not desire at this moment to urge the Government to take any particular step, and I do not wish to raise any debate on the subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which are now repealed and disposed of finally. I merely take the opportunity of calling attention to the question on the present occasion, with the view of inducing them to put matters straight, so to speak, before they bring in the next Estimates. I have avoided bringing up this matter on other Votes, and I shall avoid bringing it up on any other Vote of the present Estimate, although, if hon. Members will turn to page 81, they will see that besides the £5,514 which has been expended, or, at least, which has to be voted for the general expenses of hospitals, there is a sum not far short of that amount, included in various Votes, intended to be devoted to purposes connected with the Contagious Diseases Acts. For instance, in Vote 9, Sub-head G, £552 is taken for police. There are a good many items of that kind. While I bring this matter up for the future consideration of the Government, there is one point upon which I should like some information now. £500 is taken "for carrying out similar measures in the Colonies." That item is £100 greater than it was in the previous year. That increase is, no doubt, owing to some reason which we can have explained to us. But what I particularly wish to impress upon the right hon. Gentlemen who are now managing the affairs of the Army and Navy is that the vote of the House in repealing the Contagious Diseases Acts is considered by myself, and those who with me took part in the agitation against the Acts, to extend to the Crown Colonies, and to those Dependencies which are directly under the control of Parliament, or of Ministers and officers responsible to Parliament. Therefore, this item of £500 "for carrying out similar measures in the Colonies" is one upon which I should like some statement from the Government.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): Before the right hon. Gentleman replies, I should like to offer one or two observations with respect to the question raised by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Stuart). The hon. Member seems to be of opinion that the supervision should be as light as possible, and that every facility should be given for the propagation of these diseases. I am of a different opinion. I think that the late Government acted in a most unjustifiable manner, and for this reason—they practically repealed an Act of Parliament, which had been agreed to by both Houses of Parliament and assented to by Her Majesty, by a simple Resolution of one House of Parliament. I hold that that is a most unConstitutional proceeding on the part of the late Government. If they had wished to act in a proper manner, they should have introduced a Bill for the repeal of the Acts; and if the two Houses of Parliament agreed to the repeal, then they would have been perfectly justified in not putting the Acts in operation. As long as the Acts remain it is the duty of the Government to have them properly and fairly administered.

Mr. JAMES STUART: The hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. Biggar) is about six months behind the fair. A Bill to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts was introduced and passed through both this and the other House. It was passed through this House early in April this year *nemine contradicente*, and I should have thought every Member was aware of that fact. Any Member who is not aware of that fact is justly described as being behind the fair.

Mr. BRODRICK: In reply to the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Stuart) there is no question that the Contagious Diseases Acts were repealed, and the Government are prepared to give a loyal expression to the views which Parliament has taken. The sum appearing in the Estimates was placed in them before the decision of Parliament was taken. It is continued for these hospitals; but it will disappear from the Estimates at the close of the present financial year.

Mr. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): Is the Secretary of State able to give any statistics showing the increase or decrease which has taken place since the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts? When the first Resolution against the Acts was passed in 1884 the Acts ceased, I believe, to be worked; and the Secretary of State for War—the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington)—was able to give the House some figures which were, at the time, considered of a very alarming character. Now that six months has elapsed since the Acts repealing the Acts was passed, the Secretary of State may probably be in a position to state the result.

Mr. BRODRICK: No statistics have been presented; but if the hon. Gentleman likes to ask me a question on some future day I may be able to give him some information.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): May I ask why it is, if the Acts have been repealed, the hospital at Cork is being carried on? I see there is £416 put down as general expenses. I understand that the admissions to the hospital are voluntary; and I have heard—and I have no reason to doubt the statement—that the number of admissions during the past year have been simply insignificant. I sincerely trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will see fit to put an end to this sham and humbug. Again, I should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether, in the event of these establishments being abolished, the medical men who have been in attendance will receive any retiring allowance or pension? Most of them have been for a considerable time in this particular line of service, and I know that most of them have been the losers by adopting this branch of the Profession. I trust that they will not be sent adrift without any recognition at all.

Mr. BRODRICK: I am not aware of the circumstances attending the hospital to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention; but the matter will be attended to.

Mr. JAMES STUART: So far as it goes the answer of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Brodrick) is satisfactory; but he did not answer the second part of my question, which had reference to the item of £500 "for carrying out similar measures in the Colonies." I should like know what the Government intend to do with regard to the Crown Colonies, and other Dependencies which are directly under the control of this House, or of Officers or Ministers responsible to this House?

MR. BRODRICK: The item of £500 must remain part of the Vote until the arrangements for the future are completed.

DR. TANNER: Have I to understand that no retiring allowance will be made to the medical men who have attended the Contagious Diseases Hospitals?

MR. W. H. SMITH: These arrangements cease on the 31st of March next. The condition of the medical officers will be considered, and if they are entitled to a pension it will be given them.

DR. TANNER: What length of service will entitle them to a pension?

MR. W. H. SMITH: The hon. Gentleman has not given me any Notice of this Question, and I am not in a position to give him an answer. I really do not know under what conditions the medical men are serving.

DR. TANNER: These points are really of practical importance, and this is the only time that we have for eliciting definite information from hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who sit on the Treasury Bench. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether any difference will be made in the pensions or retiring allowances of the medical officers belonging to this Department, and those of medical men in civil practice?

MR. W. H. SMITH: Again, Sir, I have every wish to give the hon. Gentleman information; but it is not in my power to give him, on this point, an answer which would be at all satisfactory. I assure him, however, that the question he has raised shall receive most careful attention.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I see that £200 is put down as commission for bankers. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will consider the advisability of issuing money to officers and men at certain stations abroad, where gold is not the standard, at the then rate of exchange? At present there is a system under which a more or less arbitrary rate is fixed from time to time—notably at Hong Kong—and officers have to accept the exchange without any chance of recovering any loss they may sustain. I must confess I never understood the policy or justice of that arrangement. The officers stipulate for a certain rate of pay per diem. That pay is calculated on the standard coin of the Realm—namely, gold; and they have a right to receive the exact equivalent for the gold due to them, on whatever station they may be. Why this equivalent is not paid in the current coin of the station I never could understand; but, as a matter of fact, it is not. An arbitrary sum is paid to these officers. I would suggest that the present system should be abolished, and that these officers should get the equivalent of their gold pay.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I concur in the spirit of the remarks of the hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor), and wish it were possible to introduce an arrangement under which officers in Her Majesty's Service would always get the exact equivalent for English money in the pay they receive in foreign parts. But the conditions under which payments are made abroad are laid down by Treasury Circular. I will confer with my hon. Friends at the Treasury to see if it is possible to improve upon the existing arrangement. No doubt, the object in view in issuing the Warrant under which the rate of exchange is fixed for the year is to prevent complication of accounts, and to obviate inconvenient disputes which might arise between officers and men as to the particular rate of exchange on a particular day. I am afraid it would be extremely difficult to determine the exact rate of exchange on the very day the money was paid to the troops; but no doubt it is only fair that the ordinary rates of exchange should be observed in paying Her Majesty's soldiers and sailors abroad.

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): I notice that in this Vote there is an item for the Engineers' Department, and I wish to say a word in connection with that Department, as to the employment of contractors, especially building contractors. The contracts for building are advertised through the Engineers' Department. Contracts are in that way invited; but when a contractor gets one of these contracts he finds himself in a very awkward position. He may be an independent person, entirely unconnected with these officials, and having little or no experience in the matter of these contracts——

THE CHAIRMAN: There does not appear to be any item here regarding contracts made with the Engineering Department. The hon. Gentleman, therefore, is speaking wide of the Vote.

MR. HARRIS: I felt I was somewhat out of Order. It was on Vote 14 I should have made my observations; but I saw that in the present Vote there was an item connected with the Engineering Department, and I did not think it would be outside the scope of the Vote to complain that, through the conduct of the engineering officials, the contractors are made somewhat to suffer. However, if I am really not in Order I will not proceed in the matter.

MR. PYNE (Waterford, W.): I wish to call attention to an item of £500 here. Is it for medals won by soldiers, or what?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR OFFICE (Mr. BRODRICK) (Surrey, Guildford): It is for medals for distinguished services in the field.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Are any of them for the Canadian boatmen who served in the Egyptian Campaign? I understand it was intended to grant these men medals.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): A separate Vote was taken for that last year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £135,500, to complete the sum for War Office.

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.): Now, perhaps, I shall be in Order in drawing attention to the treatment contractors receive at the hands of the Engineers' Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; any observations of that kind would be equally out of Order on this Vote.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): On the point of Order I would draw your attention, Sir, to an item on page 85, headed "Works Division," under which money is taken for an Inspector General of Fortifications, a Director of Works, Assistant Director of Works, Inspector of Iron Structures for Defensive Purposes, Inspector of Sub-Marine Mining, and so on. As I understand it, it is with regard to work under this Department that my hon. Friend wishes to address the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am distinctly of opinion that the hon. Member's observations relating to the conditions under which contracts for works are carried on should have been made under Vote 13, which is the Works Vote.

MR. HARRIS (Galway, E.)—[*Cries of* "Order!"]: I wish hon. Gentlemen opposite would be as anxious to keep in Order as I am. Perhaps, Mr. Courtney, if you allowed me to continue a little you would find I was perfectly in Order. What I was striving to approach is that the great power resting with the gentlemen named in this Vote is injurious to the contractors and the Public Service.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be destructive of all Order in these debates to permit the hon. Gentleman to make his observations on the present Vote. Any question on the subject referred to must be raised on Report.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): If the hon. Member moves to reduce the Vote for the purpose of impeaching the conduct of these officials, would he not be in Order?

THE CHAIRMAN: He would not.

SIR JOHN SWINBURNE (Staffordshire, Lichfield): On the Vote for the Intelligence Department, on page 84, I wish to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will be able to give directions or make arrangements to have the maps which are printed in connection with the Intelligence Department supplied and sold to the public? The maps are extremely valuable when they relate to new countries, and for one particular reason of all others—namely, because they are reliable as far as they go. There are many maps made by land speculators of parts of Africa and America; and I suppose now we shall be offered by these gentlemen maps of Burmah. In these maps we find large tracts of land shown, marked "rich, rolling prairie;" and these very same tracts, if we had a Government map, we should probably find marked "sandy desert; no water; no vegetation." The Government maps I refer to I have frequently applied for, and through the courtesy of the War Department I have been permitted to see them; but they are not supplied to this House, nor to the Royal Geographical Society. If we come to the House for the geographical information we are in search of, we almost invariably find that the maps in the Library are obsolete, being 12 months old, and we are told that no more copies can be supplied. When we apply to the War Office for the new maps we may require the answers we receive are several. First, we are informed that the War Office Intelligence Department is not established for the purpose of giving intelligence to the public; secondly, they say they have no means of telling, and that, therefore, it would be very costly to issue the maps to the public; and, fourthly, it is stated that, though a certain number of these maps are printed for use in the War Department, they are not even supplied to Cabinet Ministers, or to the different Departments of the Public Service; and that, therefore, the Department does not see its way to giving them even to the Library of the House of Commons. Now, if we who apply for these maps did so in order to make them public, the state of things would be very different; but, looking at the very keen competition we have in our Colonies all over the world, with Germany in particular, it is important that our merchants and manufacturers should have the latest information procurable in regard to the development of new countries. Take, for example, the Transvaal. Four or five years ago our War Department made excellent maps of that country. A large portion of the Transvaal is rapidly being developed, owing to gold having been found in it in considerable and paying quantities. Well, our merchants and manufacturers who wish to send out machinery have no reliable information as to the character of the country to guide them, and there is none except in the hands of the War Department. I would, therefore, ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) to make some arrangement by which these maps may be supplied to the public in the same way that documents are issued through the Stationery Department or the Ordnance Department; for these Departments supply maps through Messrs. Stanford and other publishing firms. One of the reasons given for not allowing the issue of these maps to the public is that they are not correct; but I would reply to that, that it is of very small importance to our merchants and manufacturers who trade with our Colonies whether or not a particular point or town is two or three miles out of its proper latitude, so long as the distances are given pretty accurately and the rivers and general contour of the country are represented with some amount of care. The Expedition of Sir Charles Warren, which cost this country about £1,000,000, collected information, from which a map was prepared. It is an excellent map so far as it goes, and if the public could obtain it through any map-seller there is no doubt that large numbers would be quickly called for not only in England, but in South Africa, and the profit which would in this way be made would save the country from any additional expense in carrying out the plan I suggest. The result of not having these maps is that after a time private individuals bring out maps; but for many purposes these productions come too late. We have to go to Germany to get the latest published maps, and as a consequence of the advantage the Germans possess over us in the matter of information concerning these new countries a great deal of the trade of our merchants and manufacturers is taken by the foreigner. The pioneers are usually Californian or Australian manufacturers, because the English traders do not like sending out to places about which they cannot obtain information. The Germans get ahead of us, and when once the Germans get thoroughly established by their agents it is a very difficult thing indeed to displace them. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to take into his serious consideration the advisability not only of allowing these maps to be supplied to the House of Commons and the Royal Geographical Society, but of allowing them to be sold to the public immediately they are published. I do not believe that the public would be put to any loss by the adoption of the plan I propose; for I feel convinced that the profit on the sale of these maps would more than recoup the authorities for any expense they might be put to.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR OFFICE (Mr. BRODRICK) (Surrey, Guildford): In reply to the hon. Baronet I have to say that this subject of maps has not been brought under the notice of my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith), and that we are much obliged to the hon. Baronet for having called our attention to it. It is, of course, of importance that we should not be behind hand in supplying information which is of advantage to the public, and which is not required to be kept secret by considerations of public policy. The subject will be carefully investigated, and I trust with a result which will afford satisfaction to the hon. Baronet.

SIR JOHN SWINBURNE: The late Government had this matter before them; but owing to their having to leave Office were not able to take any steps with regard to it.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £9,400, to complete the sum for Rewards for Distinguished Services.

(7.) £39,700, to complete the sum for Half Pay.

(8.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £687,400, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Retired Pay, Retired Full Pay, and Gratuities for Reduced and Retired Officers, including Payments awarded by the Army Purchase Commissioners, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I wish to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War on this Vote. The Committee are aware that a large number of officers have been and are annually compulsorily retired, although they are quite capable and efficient. The Committee must, from its own personal experience, be aware of the fact that officers are sometimes retired as young as 40. When this system was introduced I remember speaking upon it in the House for an hour, pointing out its disadvantages and going through the Blue Books; but it had no effect whatsoever. At one time the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) backed me up; but when he took Office as Secretary of State for War he seemed to think that the system had been so long in use that it should be allowed to go on. Compulsory retirement is only a small benefit. It is a benefit to those who want promotion; but it is a mistaken system. To say that at the age of 40 a man who is quite fit for service should become an idler on a good salary is absurd. Why, at that age an officer has at least 15 years of capacity and good service remaining in him—for I think you may take 55 as the age up to which an officer is fit for work if he is in fair health. When you retire a man 15 or 16 years before he has reached that age and pay him £250, £300, or £400 a-year—£250 is the lowest —you find that the total cost to the State mounts up to a considerable sum. I think it high time that the Secretary of State should state whether or not he intends to continue this system. I look upon it as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. I think the country is wasting its money, and that the time has come when the Secretary of State should say that he will seriously investigate this matter. I should not be surprised to see the sum that this compulsory retirement costs the country mount up to £400,000 or £500,000 a-year, or even over £1,000,000.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): There is the very considerable charge of £41,718 for Paymasters. It must strike everyone that such an annual charge merely for the disbursement of salaries is extremely heavy and burdensome, and it appears to me that some system should be devised by which officers might be paid in a much more economical manner. I do not see why payments should not be made by cheque, or why some other method could not be introduced whereby the Government could save the country this enormous sum which it pays to a class of individuals for discharging purely nominal functions. On page 100 the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will find a list of these Paymasters. The Chief Paymasters get £2,400, the Staff Paymasters £20,178 2*s.* 6*d.*, the ordinary Paymasters £18,223 7*s.* 6*d.*, the Deputy Paymasters £803, and the Assistants £114 1*s.* 3*d.*, making a total of £41,718 11*s.* 3*d*.

THE CHAIRMAN: The observations of the hon. Member, I am afraid, are out of Order. This Vote refers to retired pay.

MR. M. J. KENNY: I was referring to Vote 19.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be out of Order to discuss the duties of the Paymasters under this Vote.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): On the question of compulsory retirement I hope the Secretary of State for War will give special consideration to the case of Colonels commanding regiments. By the end of 1887 there will be 100 more additional Colonels, mostly men in the prime of life and able-bodied, retired under the present costly system, who will draw a large additional sum under this Vote. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will not lose sight of this matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The Committee will remember that reference was made to this subject by the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) and several other hon. and gallant Gentlemen on this side of the House last Session, and that they were replied to by the Secretary of State for War, who stated that the subject was under his careful consideration. When I came into Office I found that that consideration had advanced very considerably. When I arrived at the War Office last month I found that the immediate result of the consideration which had been given to the matter was that the Warrant of Her Majesty for the compulsory retirement of Captains and Majors had been suspended. That suspension had come into effect; but the hon. and gallant Gentleman is aware that the re-arrangement of these matters involves very serious and careful calculation and consideration. I can only say that I am bestowing upon the matter the best consideration I can by the light of the information collected by the late Secretary of State, and that I hope to be able to propose an arrangement which will lessen ultimately the very serious additional charge which results from the present system of retirement. The charge directly arising from the retirement of officers at an early age is somewhat less than is generally supposed, but the indirect result is no doubt considerable, because the compulsory retirement, to a large extent, stimulates voluntary retirement. I fully realize the importance of the matter, and, as the Committee will remember, I spoke upon it last Session. It is one of the questions which will be most seriously considered; and, certainly, no effort on my part will be wanting to grapple with this difficulty of retired pay, and also with the other matters to which hon. Members have referred.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Hon. Members must be aware that compulsory retirement is a heart-breaking thing to men in the Service; and certainly, from the experience we have had of it in the past, that retirement is one of the bugbears in Her Majesty's Service. The right hon. Gentleman the Predecessor of the present Secretary of State for War has acted wisely in bringing about this change so far as regards Captains and Majors; but I hope and trust and believe that the right hon. Gentleman, having gone so far, will go still further. We all know the old saying—"*C'est le premier pas qui coûte*"—that, having taken the first step, he will go on. We know perfectly well that in the present day a great many Colonels in Her Majesty's Service are not gentlemen very advanced in life; and what is a grievance with the Major is usually a grievance with the Colonel. It is within my own knowledge that within the last couple of years one of the smartest officers in Her Majesty's Service, an officer commanding a distinguished Cavalry regiment, was obliged to retire in the very prime of life, and, finding a difficulty in obtaining suitable employment, he had to leave this country and go off to the Colonies. We know that these gentlemen who are brought up in a profession like the profession of arms are thoroughly unsuited to take up any ordinary line of business. As a rule they become farmers. That is notably the case in Ireland, and they show by their results that they are the very worst farmers in the world. This is a subject which is well worthy of the consideration of the Government. But it is not all. We should, I think, deprecate any check upon voluntary retirement. We know that voluntary retirement was checked not long ago in the case of majors who wished to retire, but had not their 25 years' complete. The right hon. Gentleman will understand how unjust that system is, and that it ought not to be allowed to continue. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will also pay some little attention to the subject of pensions, the proper way of dealing with which is by a sliding scale. A graduated scale might be fixed up to 24 years, and at 25 years retirement might take place. We know that in the Service—notably in the Militia—the number of Majors has increased. With regard to honorary rank on retirement, I understand that this is not appreciated by good officers, because it is practically the shadow without the substance, and it is given to them as a means of saving the public purse. I think this is a shabby way of dealing with persons who have served their country during a considerable portion of their lives; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will discover some way of doing without this system of conferring honorary rank on retiring officers. It is not only useless, but positively injurious to the officers, because they are looked up to by the public as peeple of more importance than they really are. And, what is more, these gentlemen look forward to pay in proportion to their rank. We know that when an officer leaves the Service he is expected to maintain the rank conferred upon him, and he will be called upon to spend more money in his rank than would a lieutenant or captain; and that is, in itself, sufficient to prove that honorary rank on retirement is not only of no use, but a mischief to the man upon whom it is conferred. Then, Sir, I think that all garrison appointments should be thrown open, and that institutions like Chelsea Hospital and the Royal Body Guard should all be officered from the Army. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not be deterred from consulting the interest of the officers in the Service; and I am convinced that in his action he will not only receive the sanction of this House, but of the country at large.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(9.) £59,700, to complete the sum for Widows' Pensions, &c.

(10.) £6,900, to complete the sum for Pensions for Wounds.

(11.) £12,200, to complete the sum for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I shall be glad to be informed if there is any prospect of Chelsea Hospital being done away with, or being merged into the Establishment at Pall Mall? I believe that in this way a great saving would be effected, and I know that there are many in authority who are in favour of the change. The reason why this has not been carried out is that there are four or five gentlemen who object to the change; but I believe it would be a great advantage to the Service if the present arrangement were put an end to, and a transfer made to Pall Mall. There are certain funds in connection with the Hospital which the authorities arrogate to themselves the right to appropriate in the most extraordinary manner. Last year the authorities of the Hospital took upon themselves to supplement a Vote of this House on the ground that the provision for a certain officer was inadequate; they supplemented in this way a Vote of the House of Commons, and they maintained that they were within their right in doing so. The pay of the Staff is as follows. The secretary receives £700, and the principal clerk £300 a-year; these are entitled to pensions; but besides that there is the sum of £300 a-year, not mentioned in these Estimates, in connection with the payment of prize money, with regard to which I say that the whole history of the payment of prize money in this country is simply scandalous. I invite the right hon. Gentleman to consider the desirability of changing the whole system, and transferring the staff to Pall Mall.

Mr. A. BLANE (Armagh, S.): I find that there is a charge of £137 for the chaplain at Kilmainham Hospital, and that there is next to it a charge of £75 only for the officiating Roman Catholic clergyman. I do not understand why a Roman Catholic clergyman should receive only half the amount paid to a clergyman of the Established Church for services at Kilmainham.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £742,100, to complete the sum for Out-Pensions.

Mr. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): I have frequently known of Army officers who have served a long time, and retired on pensions of varying amounts. Those pensions have been sufficient to keep them as long as they were able to work; but when they were no longer able to work these pensions were quite insufficient for the support of themselves and their families. I have had a complaint sent to me by an Army officer in the North of Ireland, who served with considerable distinction as private and sergeant in the Crimean War; he was seriously wounded; his wound did not heal, and, although he was able to use his leg for several years, ossification set in and he was no longer able to work. He applied for some increase of pension, but his application was refused. And it is the case that all these applications for increase of pensions have been refused by the Chelsea Department. I ask whether there is any rule for officers of a certain age under which they may rely on receiving consideration from the Authorities for the more increased recognition of their services? I think that their being unable to work entitles them to an increase of pension. It would be unreasonable to expect that the Secretary of State for War, who has only been in Office for a short time, should be acquainted with details of this kind; but I trust he will take the subject into his consideration. If I thought that my application would meet with any success I could supply the names of several men who are unable to subsist on their present pensions.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR OFFICE (Mr. BRODRICK) (Surrey, Guildford): In reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I must point out that in so large a Service the question of pensions must be decided by general rules, and all such rules must occasionally press hardly on individuals. A general rule is laid down at the War Office with regard to pensions which it is impossible to relax, and we cannot undertake to exercise discretion in reviewing cases of hardship.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): There are many hard cases of this kind, and I have myself called at the Treasury and War Office about some which were within my own knowledge. There are many cases of men who are compulsorily discharged with pensions for five years only, and that after they have been 17 years in the Service. I hope the Secretary of State for War will take powers to deal with cases of the kind.

Vote *agreed to.*

(13.) £98,000, to complete the sum for Superannuation Allowances.

(14.) £20,900, to complete the sum for Retired Allowances, &c. to Officers of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Forces.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again," put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [6th September] *reported.*

(1.) "That a sum, not exceeding £30,800, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for Divine Service, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I regret, Sir, I was not present last evening when this Vote was taken, for I had intended to call the attention of the House to the fact that there happens to be two chaplains doing duty in Cork, and that they drew £594 per annum. On reference to *Thom's Almanac*, I find there are three chaplains at Cork, and I gather that one of them is not paid. I cannot help thinking that as regards pay there ought not to be any distinctions drawn between these chaplains—that, in fact, they ought to receive equal pay. The garrison chaplain, or the Church of England chaplain, has very many advantages that do not fall to the lot of the Roman Catholic chaplain. The latter lives down in the town, he has a long distance to go in all kinds of weather to his duties; indeed, his position is most unsatisfactory, and I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will endeavour to find a remedy. I had intended to move to reduce the Vote, and to take a division; but I will leave the matter to the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman, in the hope that he will see justice is done. It must be borne in mind that there is a large percentage of Irish soldiers in the Army, and that a very large majority of them are Catholics. It therefore follows that the Catholic chaplains have a considerable amount of work to do, more, indeed, than it is generally thought they have. If they have considerable work to do they should be paid for it, and they should be granted all the advantages which are afforded to other chaplains. Sub-head D relates to payments for buildings for Divine Service. My original intention was to move the reduction of the Vote by £320, that being the amount proposed to be granted for this purpose. My reason was that, as a rule, the only churches to be maintained are Protestant churches. I think it is very wrong and foolish to make invidious distinctions. We know that at large stations, notably at camps like the Curragh and Aldershot, where there are large numbers of soldiers, it becomes necessary that a building should be put up for all religions. Usually a large building, resembling very much a large barn, is erected, and at one time the service of the Church of England is conducted in it, at another time the service of the Presbyterian Church, and at another time the service of the Roman Catholic Church. Such a course may suit soldiers, but it appears to be a very crude and rough way of arranging for Divine Service, and therefore I think the right hon. Gentleman might take this point into careful consideration. Again, there is another point I should like to call attention to, and that is that in the Cork district there is no payment for buildings for the Catholic service, although every Sunday sittings are reserved for soldiers at a mass in one of the Catholic churches of the city. This is certainly not a generous way of dealing with the matter. While the Protestant soldiers have got a church of their own in the barracks, the Catholics and the Presbyterians have to go down the town at great inconvenience to themselves. The Government maintain the Protestant church, but they do nothing towards the maintenance of the Catholic and Presbyterian places of worship, though they take advantage of their existence. This is manifestly unfair, and I think it would be very reprehensive in me if I did not bring the present state of things to the notice of the Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I have listened with attention to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman, and I cannot help thinking that he has been somewhat misinformed. He asks for certain generosity of treatment. Well, but generosity of treatment involves a considerable addition to the charge for the Public Service. I shall endeavour that there shall be justice done in all cases. I believe there is equality of treatment at the present moment. [Dr. TANNER: No.] Well, I think there is. The hon. Gentleman has made some remarks with regard to the buildings in which Divine Service is held. I am afraid it is not possible to provide Roman Catholic and Presbyterian and Wesleyan Methodist and other chapels in connection with every barracks.

DR. TANNER: I did not mention the minor sects. ["Oh!"] I believe I am perfectly justified in speaking of the sects other than those I have specified as the minor sects. It is only necessary to call attention to the treatment of the larger denominations.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I stated that I have the strongest desire to do justice all round.

DR. TANNER: May I ask whether the Presbyterian chaplain——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman has already spoken.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions 2 to 8, inclusive, *agreed to.*

(9.) "That a sum, not exceeding £426,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. A. L. BROWN (Hawick, &c.): As I have not spoken upon the Estimates, perhaps the House will allow me to call its attention to what I consider a question of considerable importance. The Director of the Clothing Establishment is in receipt of a salary of £1,200 a-year, and he is required to pass material to the value of £1,500,000. I maintain it is perfectly impossible to get a man for such a salary who is capable of passing satisfactorily such a large quantity of material. Manufacturers and others who tender for the Army work find that things do not go on satisfactorily. The complaint which we manufacturers bring against the Department is this—that, under the present system, our soldiers do not get proper clothing, durable clothing, or satisfactory clothing in any sense of the word. The matter is of such importance to so many hon. and gallant Gentlemen opposite who, I suppose, take an interest in their men, that they will, I am sure, pay some attention to what I have to say. I should like the House to understand what manufacturers are required to do in regard to the sending in of samples. Some samples have been obtained by the Department, I do not know how many years ago, and they are sent down to some central place. Manufacturers are asked to go to the place, examine the samples, and make clothes according to the samples. Now, I want to point out that by this means the Department is wholly debarred from getting the advantage of new makes in clothing, both as to durability, colour, wear, and cheapness; and what I suggest the Department should do is that they should see that the heads of Departments are men thoroughly acquainted with the technicalities of clothing, so that they may be more competent to judge of the merits of the clothing submitted to them than they are at present. We all get great advantage by new makes. Cloth which eight years ago was used for dress coats and dress trousers is totally discarded now, simply because far better makes have come in. The Department is totally unable to get the advantage of the new makes under the present system. I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War will inquire whether the heads of the Department are thoroughly up to the work of testing cloth. Our soldiers and sailors will never be well clothed unless the heads of the Department thoroughly understand the cloth which is submitted to them by manufacturers. The country must pay for efficiency, and I hold that a man who is capable of passing properly material to the value of £1,500,000 cannot be obtained for a salary of £1,200 a-year; and I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not possible for him to see that the Service is better served than it is at present?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The hon. Gentleman says it is impossible for the Director of Clothing to pass the whole of the garments; but I must point out that the Director of Clothing is assisted by a very considerable staff.

MR. A. L. BROWN: What I wished to convey was that the heads of the Department should be thoroughly responsible. Everyone who is concerned in clothing knows that it requires one thoroughly practical man to pass everything.

MR. NORTHCOTE: The Director of Clothing is thoroughly responsible in this sense—that if any bad material is passed the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State will hold him responsible. With respect to the question of supplying proper samples to the trade, I may remind the hon. Gentleman that I have myself, since coming into Office, taken steps to secure that all samples of cloths shall be sent over to Dublin in order to give the Irish manufacturers as fair a chance as possible of competing. [*A laugh.*] I will only say to the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs, that though I am extremely anxious to do justice to the Irish manufacturers, I am equally desirous to show the same justice to Scotland.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I desire to thank the Surveyor General of Ordnance for the slip of the tongue by which he conveyed the information that the Irish manufacturers are to be benefited; I trust he will carry out his professions in the same honest spirit that seems to have characterized his utterances in this House since he took Office. But with regard to the matter raised by the hon. Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. A. L. Brown), I have to say that I am inclined to treat the Director of Clothing in an entirely different manner to that proposed by the hon. Gentleman. I think the Director of Clothing is paid quite sufficient. He is a man above reproach, I will admit; but the Surveyor General of Ordnance said he was ably assisted by a staff. I suppose the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Northcote) is aware that four members of this staff have been found guilty of bribery. ["Oh!"] Well, they have been charged with bribery, and, if the charges have not been sustained, the gentlemen have been called upon to resign their positions. Sir, the Director of Clothing is a gentleman who, as I have said, is above reproach; nay, he is more than above reproach, he is even above this House, for he sets at defiance the orders given by the Treasury Bench. I stated here last night, in the course of the discussion upon this Estimate, that the Vote given by this House in respect to contracts is not acted upon, and that the sum voted by the House is not always applied to the purpose for which it is voted. For this the gentleman whose salary the hon. Member (Mr. A. L. Brown) proposes to increase is responsible.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST INQUIRY BILL.—[Bill 35.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): I wish to say, with reference to the blocks which for some days have stood against the second reading of this Bill, that my hon. Friends in whose names the blocks stood have no desire whatever to delay the progress of the Bill. I may, in fact, remind the House that, on two occasions, we endeavoured to secure the discussion of the Bill at what we considered a reasonable hour. My hon. Friends are as anxious as I am that this inquiry should proceed immediately, and that it should be conducted and concluded under circumstances most favourable to the full effectuation of its purpose. The only object my hon. Friends had in blocking the Bill was to secure the taking of the discussion at a reasonable hour, an object in which it can scarcely be said they have succeeded. I assume this Court of Inquiry is intended to be an open Court. Owing to the nature of the case, and for several obvious reasons, publicity is indispensable; but I do not find in the Bill any declaration that the Court is to be open. I think it would be desirable, for the settling of the public mind in Belfast, that such a declaration should be specifically made. I find from the Bill that a summons to a witness directing him to attend is to—

> "Be equivalent to any form of process capable of being issued at law in any action or suit for enforcing the attendance or compelling the production of documents."

I confess I do not quite see why this specific limitation should be made. The Commission is to inquire into a prolonged series of facts of a highly criminal character, and I apprehend that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) will agree with me that the interest of the community in eliciting the truth concerning these lamentable riots, and in arriving at a just conclusion in this case, is greater and more urgent than it could possibly be in the case of any individual trial. I therefore submit that the summons issued by the Commission ought to have whatever legal force belongs to a summons or subpœna to a witness, directing him to give evidence at a criminal trial. I find that the Commission is to be vested with the powers, rights, and privileges vested in Her Majesty's High Court of Justice in Ireland. I understand that the system of the High Court of Justice in Ireland is to issue a summons as a matter of course, directing the attendance of any person to give evidence upon the application of any party to the suit. Now, the question I have to put to the right hon. and learned Gentleman is this. Is the House to understand that the Commission in Belfast will, as a matter of course, issue a summons to any person, directing him to attend, upon the application of any counsel or any party in the proceedings before them? Otherwise this provision may turn out to be nugatory. All the Commissioners appointed up to the present are strangers to the town of Belfast and to the local intricacies of political life, and it is evident that the Commissioners will not and cannot be competent to judge of whether or not any person summoned as a witness is or is not likely to give material and valuable evidence. I submit to the right hon. and learned Gentleman that, as the Commission will have to inquire into a series of acts of a highly criminal character, the persons who can give the most valuable information are those who were concerned in the fomentation, stimulation, and conduct of the riots; and it is very obvious to a layman, to say nothing of a lawyer, that the persons who can give most valuable information will be persons who will be most reluctant to attend. The application for a summons in such a case will be made by the counsel on the other side, and may be opposed by the counsel holding the same political views as the witness; and unless any party appearing before the Commission shall have a right, as a matter of course, to secure a summons to a witness to attend, we have no security whatever that the evidence material to the inquiry will be elicited before the Court. I should like from the right hon. and learned Gentleman a frank reply on this point. Again, the Commissioners are to have power to punish for contempt of Court; but contempt of Court is not defined in the Bill. I see the Home Secretary smile. Perhaps he considers it convenient that contempt of Court should be an elastic offence. I can conceive three or four ways in which contempt may be committed in this Belfast Court of Inquiry. It may be committed by refusal to attend the Court, by refusal to take oath, by refusal to produce documents when called upon, or by refusal to answer questions. I wish to learn whether the refusal to do any one of these four things will be punishable? I see the power of the Commission to punish for contempt is limited. The Judge of a Court may send a person to prison for an indefinite period for contempt; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman limits the power of the Commission to a sentence of three months' imprisonment. I can conceive that there are some people in Belfast who, if they told what they knew to the Commission, would have such a story to tell that they would prefer three months' imprisonment rather than tell it. I am not disposed to quarrel with the three months' limit; but I think it essential that the Commissioners should have power to commit persons for shorter periods, for it is obvious that if they have no option but to commit for three months or not at all, the provision will defeat its own purpose. I think the intelligent way of dealing with the matter would be to give the Commission power to send offending witnesses to prison from time to time, bringing them up again and again to inquire as to their disposition. Unless I understand from the right hon. and learned Gentleman that the Commissioners on this Judicial Commission will have power to commit witnesses to prison repeatedly for brief periods, I shall certainly myself bring up a provision intended to effect that purpose. Now, I wish to know whether the Commission have, up to the present time, given any indication to any persons of their intention to call them as witnesses, because I see that one of the most material witnesses—Dr. Kane, the person primarily concerned in the stimulation of the riots and a conspicuous figure in their progress, one of the men whose threats to the magistrates induced the withdrawal of the police from certain districts in Belfast—has started on a political mission to Canada, and has already placed himself outside the jurisdiction of the Court, unless the summons of the Court will run in the Dominion of Canada? I want to know what steps will be taken to prevent persons from going outside the jurisdiction of the Court, and what course will be taken to secure that Dr. Kane shall present himself in Court, and submit himself to examination as to his share in the riots, before the conclusion of the inquiry? I also wish to know what provision will be made to prevent the sitting of the Commission clashing with the Revision Courts? Those Courts will sit next week, and will last for a considerable period, and I am aware that one of the Commissioners is engaged as Revising Barrister, and that several gentlemen who have been engaged to appear before the Commission have also been appointed in similar capacities. It is evident that the Commission will be shorn of a great deal of its energy if the Revision Courts sit at the same time, and I therefore ask whether the Crown has made any provision for meeting this state of things? But there is a question transcending all others. This is a Bill to facilitate the work of a Commission of Inquiry, but neither the provisions of this Bill, nor the provisions of any Bill which can be invented, devised, or formulated to facilitate the work of a Commission, will be of much utility unless the Commission itself is so constituted as to command the confidence of the public. Up to the time of the introduction of this Bill, the Commission attracted little attention, and was considered of no public interest, for, as originally constituted, it had no power either to summon persons to attend or to take evidence on oath. The public knew that a person examined before the Commissioners could tell any lies he pleased, and that, if he preferred absence to lying, he could stay away altogether. It was evident that, under those circumstances, the Commission would not collect an adequate body of evidence, and therefore the Inquiry was looked upon as of no importance, and attracted very little attention. The introduction of this Bill, however, places the Inquiry on an entirely different basis. The Commissioners now will have effectual powers. They can order witnesses to attend, and can punish them for contumaciousness or for falsehood. Therefore the constitution of the Commission becomes of the highest possible importance. When the Commission was appointed in June it consisted of a General Officer as Chairman, and two junior barristers, one of the junior barristers being a Tory, and the other—though his political views are not clearly defined—being believed to be a Liberal. As for the General Officer he was totally unknown in Ireland. The people there knew nothing about him, and knew nothing of the reason of his appointment, except that it appears now to be the vogue to appoint a General Officer to everything. The first word of the present Government on coming into Office as to this Commission was that it was to be a Judicial Commission. I am at a loss to know how the Government could call the Commission a Judicial Commission, when they appoint a General Officer to preside over it. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary also said that the Commission being a Judicial Commission ought to be a small one. I must say I do not see how this Commission could be more judicial in its character, nature, or function than any other Royal Commission. It will not have to try anyone, it will not have to pass sentence on anyone. It will have a set of facts placed before it concerning the outbreak and disturbances in Belfast; it will have to investigate these facts and find out in what manner the recurrence of these disturbances can be prevented. However, suppose we assume that it will be a Judicial Commission, then we come to the Chief Secretary's statement that it shall be a small one. Why, if it is a Judicial Commission, ought it to be a small one? The right hon. Gentleman knows very well that the highest Judicial Bodies in the country, on important occasions, are constituted of a number of persons—that the highest Courts of the land are often composed of a dozen persons. What is the magic of the number proposed? I think that if the Commission consisted of five or six persons, it would be better, supposing you have them of the right sort. Then the right hon. Gentleman, having said that the Commission ought to be a Judicial Commission, and that as a Judicial Commission it ought to be a small Commission—which is a *non sequitur*—proceeded to expand it. But how did he expand it? I should have thought by the addition of one of Her Majesty's Judges, or at least of a Queen's Counsel of position, possessing legal attainments of some reputation. But that was not the method. The process of expansion was communicated to the Commission by the appointment of a Chief Constable of Police. This is a Judicial Commission; but what is there about the ordinary character or the highest function of a Chief of Police of a judicial nature? Nothing; he is strictly an Executive officer. I would, therefore, ask from the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland an explanation of the extraordinary contradiction in the idea of expanding a Judicial Commission by adding to it a Scotch Chief Constable. But why did they add this particular officer of police? There are many Chief Constables in England and Wales with quite as judicial a tone of character. When Captain Wallis M'Hardy, Chief Constable of Lanarkshire, was selected, the selection should have been made after inquiry into the judicial tone of his character, and the Chief Secretary should have satisfied himself that that judicial tone was such as to specially fit Captain M'Hardy for the work of the Commission. I have received a letter from a place where Captain Wallis M'Hardy has operated for some years as Chief Constable. The writer of the letter is unknown to me, but I have made careful inquiries as to his good faith, and I believe him to be a person entitled to credence. He writes—

> "Three years ago a Catholic Mission was given in this parish, and one evening, as a portion of the congregation which required to pass the Orange portion of the village were going home, they were attacked in the most brutal manner, several boys and girls badly injured, and one man dangerously wounded. Mr. M'Hardy came upon the scene, and the result

of his investigation was that Catholics were arrested right and left, and received from four to six months' imprisonment, and though two Orangemen were also arrested, the police, doubtless acting upon the advice of Mr. M'Hardy, refused to make a case, and they were accordingly acquitted. His whole career here has been one of violent hatred to the Catholic population, and I therefore trust you will be successful in averting what will be a dire calamity to our Catholic brethren in Belfast, if his appointment is ratified."

Captain Wallis M'Hardy has been chosen because of the judical character of his mind to assist in the investigation of disturbances in which Catholics and Protestants were the contending parties, and the opinion of my correspondent regarding this appointment is expressed in these words—

"A more intolerant bigot does not exist, always excepting Dr. Kane."

I think I may fairly call upon the right hon. and learned Gentleman to state to the House in what manner the work of this Judicial Commission is likely to be more successfully carried out by the addition of Captain Wallis M'Hardy? I confess I have been somewhat inclined to attribute his appointment to other motives. He has been connected with the police of Glasgow, or has had experience of the police of that town, owing to his connection with the county of Lanark. That is a local force under the control of the Town Council of Glasgow, and to a town like Glasgow such a force is no doubt suitable. But that is not the case in Belfast; and I know there is an underlying design amongst the local authorities there to get rid of the Royal Irish Constabulary, which is an independent force, and to substitute for it such a body as the old civic force which was condemned by the Royal Commission of 1864, who held that the Town Council of Belfast were unfit to control such a force and that such a force was unfit for the peculiar conditions of Belfast. The Town Council of Belfast want to get such a force again, and want to organize a body on whom they can rely to beat the Catholics black and blue whether they are right or wrong. I want to know whether Captain M'Hardy was put upon the Commission in order that he might influence the other Commissioners and induce them to recommend the establishment in Belfast of a similar force to that which formerly existed there? If he was, and if the establishment of such a force is proposed, I have to say this—that by whomsoever it is proposed, and at whatever time it is proposed, I shall offer it a most stern resistance. Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman reconsider the appointment of this gentleman? I felt it my duty to read the letter I had received bearing upon the qualifications of Captain M'Hardy for a place upon this Commission. [An hon. MEMBER: Name!] The hon. Member opposite is very ingenious. Does he think I am going to give him the name of the correspondent to whom I am indebted for particulars of Captain M'Hardy's history, that correspondent being a gentleman living in Captain M'Hardy's police district? I would not envy that gentleman the life he would have to lead if Captain M'Hardy knew his name. I ask will the appointment of Captain M'Hardy be maintained? I think that, even if I had not read this letter, communication between Lanarkshire and Belfast is so frequent, that the feeling which exists in Lanarkshire regarding the character of Captain M'Hardy, if it is as is declared by my correspondent, would soon have spread to Belfast, and the proceedings of the Commission would at the outset have been attended with doubts and fears occasioned by the proceedings of this gentleman in Lanarkshire. Now, I have a practical suggestion to make. The House will admit that the Commission may be increased to six Members, certainly to five, without detriment to its compactness. There are two classes of persons in whom I am interested as Member for the Western Division of Belfast. The first class is composed of all those persons, always Catholics, whose houses are plundered in time of disturbance in that town. There is no such thing as wrecking the houses of Protestants at any time. [*Laughter.*] I can reply to that laughter very effectually, because I can point out that, in response to the claims for compensation for malicious injuries presented to the Town Council, awards to the extent of £2,600 were made, and of this amount £2,500 went to Catholics. Could I offer a more conclusive fact than that? I am interested, I say, in those Catholics whose houses suffer wreck and plunder; and the second class of persons in whom I am interested is composed of 3,000 souls who have been driven out of employment, and who are dependent upon collections made at church doors, and upon other charity, for their subsistence. The interests of those classes are represented by a Committee of Catholic gentlemen, with the Bishop at their head; and what I ask is that this Catholic Committee should be allowed to draw up a list of names of gentlemen of legal training and recognized position, and that the Lord Lieutenant should from this list select one gentleman, and add him to the Committee. A representative of the general body of ratepayers might, in the same way, be selected and added to the Committee, making six in all. The Committee would still be workable, and it would possess the advantage of representing every section of the people, whilst the ratepayers, who have to pay for these riots—and pay for them through the nose—would have their interests guarded. As I have said, little or nothing is known of the gentlemen on the Commission. Little is known of the General Officer, little is known of the two legal gentlemen, and what is known of the Scotch police officer is against him. I think it essential that there should be some men on the Commission who will see that the proper persons are examined, and that no aspect of the case is left undealt with. It will be no less a Judicial Commission by the addition of the members I propose, for I have a guarantee that every name in the list of Catholics submitted to the Lord Lieutenant shall be that of a legal gentleman of such character and position that his appointment will be no derogation from the character of the Commission. I hope that any member of the Commission, when the Report is presented to the House, will have the power of adding his views to those of his colleagues. I submit it is not an unreasonable request, because not only is it desirable that the Report of the Commission should be presented, but that all aspects of the case shall be presented, and no special feature of interest shall be left out in consequence of the ignorance of local affairs on the part of the Commissioners.

Mr. HOZIER (Lanarkshire, S.): As one well acquainted with Captain M'Hardy, and also very well acquainted with the county in which he is Chief Constable, I venture to say one or two words. Captain M'Hardy has for a very considerable number of years been Chief Constable in Lanarkshire, which, without any disparagement to other districts, I may justly call the most important county in Scotland. Captain M'Hardy has invariably discharged his duties in the most admirable way possible. I am acquainted with a great many gentlemen who have to do with the police in Lanarkshire, a very near relation of my own being Chairman of the Police Committee, and I can truly say that, from all I have heard of Captain M'Hardy, nothing could possibly exceed the zeal, energy, and discretion with which he has performed his duties. I have ventured to call special attention to the fact that I am acquainted with the members of the Police Committee of Lanarkshire, because before them every complaint against the police, whether brought by Protestant or Catholic, must come; and, moreover, as my relative is the Chairman of the Committee—and we constantly discuss county business together—I should be certain to hear of everything in the nature of a complaint which came before him. I have also a a letter from him bearing the strongest testimony in Captain M'Hardy's favour. Now, in Lanarkshire, in a good many of the larger towns, there is a considerable proportion of both Orangemen and Catholics. Captain M'Hardy has thus had very great experience in dealing with disturbances similar to those at Belfast, which may, perhaps, have been sometimes caused by one side and sometimes by the other. Well, on every single occasion on which he has had to deal with these matters, he has managed with such consummate tact that he has received the approval of both parties. I have no doubt the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast has been making a good many inquiries about Captain M'Hardy; and it is rather curious and significant that the only charge he has been able to bring against him is one contained in an anonymous letter.

Mr. SEXTON: No, not anonymous.

Mr. HOZIER: Well, at any rate, we are not told the name of the writer.

Mr. SEXTON: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to say that the only inquiry I have made has been as to the *bona fides* of the writer of this letter.

MR. HOZIER: There can be no doubt in the world that if Captain M'Hardy had been such an objectionable person as the hon. Gentleman pretends, letters both signed and anonymous would have come showering upon him. He would not have had to rely on this one single solitary instance. It is a singular and striking fact that no accusation has ever been brought against Captain M'Hardy. No; by-the-bye, I am wrong. There was once an accusation brought against him, but it was one of those exceptions that prove the rule. Captain M'Hardy was accused, some years ago—at the time I fancy of the disturbance to which the hon. Gentleman alluded—I know there was a disturbance then — in a certain Scotch newspaper of a very terrible crime. He was accused of the heinous crime of having actually been seen driving in the same carriage with the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow. Now, I really do not think that that is the sort of awful accusation—even supposing Captain M'Hardy really did what was charged against him—or the sort of unpardonable offence which should render him particularly obnoxious to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I quite appreciate the assurance given by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sexton) that neither he nor anybody acting with him have any desire whatever to oppose this Bill. I can quite understand that these hon. Members—and let me say the same for hon. Members who represent other parts of Ireland—are desirous that the powers contained in the Bill should be conferred upon that body. I have nothing to object to in the criticism that the hon. Member has given to the various provisions, and I am glad to say that I think I shall be able to give him such assurances as to these provisions as will satisfy him. In the first place, it is the intention of the Irish Government to make this an open Court. I have no doubt it was intended by the late Chief Secretary, when he nominated the Commission, that the inquiry should be public. When the Commission held its first sitting it was in open Court, and it was prepared to hear anyone who had an interest in the matter, by solicitor or counsel. It would be rather out of the scope of this Bill to introduce provisions of the character mentioned by the hon. Member as to publicity; but I can assure the hon. Gentleman, on behalf of the Irish Government, that the Court will be open and accessible to everyone. As regards the way in which we confer powers on the Commission in the Bill, we do it in the fullest manner possible as to power to compel the attendance of witnesses, to compel them to give evidence, and so forth. It was very rightly said by the Chief Secretary that this was a Judicial Commission, and no one could doubt the fact, seeing that it was proposed to invest it with the powers of the High Court of Justice. It would be impossible to find language which would give more extensive powers than that contained in the Bill. Of course, it is necessary to make some provision defining the nature of the instrument by which persons can be summoned before the Commissioners. The hon. Gentleman asks how and by what means the Commissioners are to enforce the attendance of anyone whom it is supposed can give evidence which will throw light on the matter. Precisely the same power will be conferred upon this Commission, and the power will be used in the same way. Any person can apply for a summons in the ordinary way, and it rests with the Commission to grant the summons. With regard to the punishment of contempt of Court, we have thought it necessary to limit it. In all cases there is limitation as regards time of the power of imprisonment, and in this Bill it is taken from the Act appointing a Commission analogous to that with which we are now dealing. The hon. Member may be certain that the power will be exercised by the Commission, because, although unquestionably that power is only for a week's imprisonment, the Commission can have the individual brought up for each offence, and on his refusing he can be recommitted so long as his imprisonments does not altogether exceed three months. The hon. Member has referred to four matters, and asked whether they would constitute a contempt of Court. I can assure him that each of those matters is a contempt of Court within the meaning of this Bill and within the law. The Bill is intended to take steps to insure persons coming before the Court. Of course, no steps could be taken to bring up persons who were out of the jurisdiction. I am quite sure that the Legislature would not confer on the Commission power to detain anyone in the country on the ground that his evidence was required. We must trust, then, to circumstances, knowing that this power is not conferred on the Court. With regard to the sittings of the Court clashing with those of the Revision Court, that difficulty, if it should arise, would be met by the Commissioner, if a Revising Barrister, obtaining a substitute. I think I have now dealt with the various questions arising on the structure of the Bill, and I come now to a matter of importance referred to by the hon. Member—namely, the constitution of the Commission. I will inform the hon. Member that, as regards the three Commissioners originally appointed, the Irish Government had nothing to do with their nomination. They were nominated by the late Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and no doubt he was actuated by the same desire as the present Government have of getting men fully qualified to perform the duties, and to bring to them a perfectly impartial mind. I know all the gentlemen in question, and can say that they entirely fulfil those requirements. It has been said that as the functions of the Commission will be judicial it will not be necessary to enlarge it. I am sure hon. Members must admit that the functions of the Commission would be eminently judicial, and that we are dealing with a Commission which will be called on to discharge important functions; but it must be borne in mind also that the Commissioners will also be engaged in taking evidence, perusing documents, &c., and that their duties will be extensive. I do not mean to say that it would be necessary to have a large Commission for that purpose; but, having regard to all the circumstances, it has been thought necessary to increase the Commission. The hon. Member has referred to the fact that one addition has been made to the Commission, and he asks why it is that such addition has been made. It will be observed that one of the most important matters which the Commission will have to take into consideration is the present constitution of the police force in Belfast, the duties they are called upon to discharge, and the mode in which they discharge them; and it occurred to the Irish Government that it was desirable to have some person of experience to deal with these matters upon the Commission. The first suggestion was that we should have someone connected with the Police Service in Dublin; but we were unable to get such a person, and were therefore compelled to look elsewhere. It is necessary that the person so appointed should be one having experience with the constabulary in a large town. Accordingly, Captain M'Hardy was chosen, he having had great experience as Chief of the Police in Glasgow. I have the assurance of everyone competent to speak on the subject that he is perfectly indifferent and perfectly impartial with regard to the matters that will be considered, and, further, that he is a most competent man and of the highest character. The hon. Member made the suggestion that a gentleman representing the Catholics in Belfast, to be chosen by a committee of the ratepayers or the Corporation of Belfast, should be added to the Commission. I must say that I have a strong objection to any such course, and I do not believe that Her Majesty's Government would for a moment entertain the proposal. We are most desirous of getting persons on the Commission who have no bias. I have no doubt whatever that the gentleman proposed to be placed on the Commission would be a person of the highest honour and respectability; but from the circumstance that he was nominated by any particular committee would afford colour to the suggestion that he was in the position of a partizan. I recollect being myself engaged in an arbitration involving many thousands of pounds, on which there was a gentleman who occasionally spoke of "our side" and "the other side." Well, Sir, that is what I think would perhaps result from the proposal of the hon. Gentleman, that one of the Commissioners should be nominated by the Corporation of Belfast. We are merely desirous of extracting evidence in such a way that when it is obtained it shall prove satisfactory in the end and render the Report of the Commission, as I believe it will be, a very valuable document. Finally, the hon. Member said that it occurred to him that the Government intended to bring back the old civil force to Belfast; but I can assure him that so far as Belfast is concerned there is no intention that the police force should be a civil force; and I desire to disabuse him of the idea that there is lurking in the mind of the Government any such intention.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): It must be evident to the Committee that unless the constitution of this Commission is thoroughly satisfactory to both sides, it would be better to have no inquiry at all. It is important that the people of Belfast should be thoroughly convinced of the impartiality of the Commission; and in saying this I do not mean that Captain M'Hardy is not an impartial Commissioner. But there are certain facts connected with him which, to say the least of it, are unfortunate. First of all, it is unfortunate that he should be connected with the police force of a Provincial town where there is a considerable number of Orangemen, and a large section of the population of the town of Belfast regret that the Government should have selected a man who has made himself so prominent in the way my hon. Friend has described. The declaration with which the right hon. and learned Gentleman wound up his speech is a very useful one, and carries satisfaction to our minds; but, at the same time, I point out that it gives us no assurance that Captain M'Hardy may not report in favour of the old system; and the doubt which exists on the subject is one cause of our objection to his appointment. Another cause is this—while two legal members of the Commission might balance each other, one being a Liberal and the other a Conservative, the other two members are men whose political leanings and sympathies were entirely unknown to the Irish Representatives, who have no means of ascertaining that they are not strong partizans. I do not accuse the President of the Commission of partizanship; but we know that he has recently been promoted, a fact which would lead us to believe that he is a friend of the General in command. We know that many officers in the Army are extremely strong in their views with regard to Irish affairs, and have expressed themselves in a manner that shows they are utterly unfit to be appointed to this Commission. The evidence laid before us goes to show that they are against the Catholics and for the Protestants. The Commission, then, is to consist of three Protestants, one of whom sympathizes with the Orange Party, and the other two are persons about whose impartiality we have no information whatever. I do not mean to say that we are not perfectly prepared to leave the whole of this investigation in the hands of English Protestant gentleman. I should, for my own part, rather leave the construction of the Commission in the hands of Gentlemen in this House, provided always that they would select men whom we know to be impartial. If the two Protestants I have referred to are men who sympathize with the Orange Party and are strong Unionists, the probability is that the Report of the Commission will be entirely in favour of the Unionist cause; and we are entitled to urge on the Government the necessity of somewhat modifying this Commission, or else of supplying us with some information which will place the impartiality of the members of the Commission beyond doubt in our minds. I suggest that the relations of Captain M'Hardy with the Commission should be limited in certain respects. Let him give evidence of his experience in dealing with these cases; let him act as an assistant to the Commission; let him act as an expert in suggesting the class of questions to be put to the police, and inform, and advise, and counsel the Commissioners as to the direction of their inquiries. In these respects he might be very useful, although he would not be empowered to take part in the deliberations of the Commission. I cannot see how the Government can expect us to accept this Commision until we know something more about the men who are to compose it. We are asked to plunge into this matter absolutely in the dark, and to commit the interests of Catholics in Belfast to a Commission composed of persons who are as unknown to us as if we only heard their names yesterday. It is impossible that the people of Belfast will have any confidence in the Commission unless they are convinced that these men are impartial men, without prejudice in this political question, and that they are men thoroughly above suspicion.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) has referred to the fact that this Commission appointed to inquire into questions connected with the disturbances arising out of political meetings in Belfast will be composed of three Protestants and one Catholic. The number of the Commissioners being four, I should like to know, if in forming the Report differences should arise and there should be equality of voices, who is to have the casting vote? The President of the Commission, I believe, will be General Bulwer; and the Catholic Party will be at a decided disadvantage, because, as the Attorney General for Ireland has said, it is reasonable to suppose that the Commissioners will to some extent take sides. I think that is an argument in favour of increasing the number of Commissioners to five. In that case there would be more chance of fairness. As has been pointed out by my hon. Friend, it would be easy to select a Protestant to fill the office of Commissioner without going to Scotland for the purpose; and as there have been some doubts thrown upon the *bona fides* of Captain M'Hardy, I think it would be well to select some person in Ireland to act on the Commission for the purpose of assisting its deliberations. I hope the Chief Secretary for Ireland will succeed in inducing the Irish Government to associate another Commissioner with those named at the present time, in order to give confidence to the people of Belfast, and lead them to believe that the Commission appointed will desire to do impartial justice.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I assure the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. Kenny) that the sole wish I and my Colleagues in the Irish Government have had in this matter has been to endeavour to select for the Commission those who we thought would come to an impartial decision. I need not say anything of the two barristers, Mr. Trench and Mr. Adams, who have been appointed Members of the Commission. Mr. Trench is a gentleman of very considerable experience at the Bar, he is a counsel of standing; and Mr. Adams is also a gentleman of experience and ability. Some doubt has been cast by the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) on the propriety of the appointment of General Bulwer. I think that doubt is absolutely undeserved. General Bulwer is, I believe, no politician at all. I have no notion what his political opinions are. I do not think he ever expressed them, or ever devoted his mind to political matters. He is a soldier who has done good service in many capacities, especially as Inspector General of Recruiting. I doubt whether you could find in the British Army a man whose position and past conduct gives greater proof of his capacity for arriving at an impartial decision in this matter. Then as to Captain Wallis M'Hardy, We have heard statements from the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) as to the partiality of Captain Wallis M'Hardy towards the Protestant side; but as my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) has informed the House we have received very strong remonstrances from what we may call the Orange quarter against the appointment of Captain Wallis M'Hardy. I have made very careful inquiry as to Captain Wallis M'Hardy's capacity, impartiality, and ability in the administration of the Police Force in so important a county as Lanarkshire, and I am satisfied there is no man more qualified to serve on a Commission of this kind than Captain Wallis M'Hardy. As to the insinuation, prompted by the appointment of Captain Wallis M'Hardy, that an attempt may be made to restore the old civic force in Belfast, I may say that the administration of the Police Force in Lanarkshire is the same as that in English counties, and that is far from being of a municipal character. I am anxious to give due consideration to all that may be urged from any quarter of the House as to the composition of this Commission; but I must say I cordially agree with what fell from my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland as to the unwisdom, to say the least of it, of a Commission of this kind being composed of representatives of the Catholic and Protestant population. I have no doubt that the views of the different sections of the population will be represented by very able advocates before the Commission—that is the very way they should be represented—and the Commission will decide on the evidence given before it. I think the only result of there being representatives of the inhabitants of Belfast on the Commission would be to spoil its impartiality, to add very greatly to the difficulty of its inquiry, and to raise great doubts as to the wisdom of the decision to which it may come instead of giving that public confidence which the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) desires.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I should be very sorry to cast any doubt upon the *bona fides* of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). I am, too, very sorry to have to speak as between Catholics and Protestants in this matter; but, unfortunately, we know that on one side these riots were largely the result of religious feeling. Under these circumstances, I think the right hon. Gentleman will admit that Catholics have some right to complain that this tribunal should be composed of three Protestants and only one Catholic.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The Secretary, a very important person on the Commission, is a Roman Catholic.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: If Captain Wallis M'Hardy were in the same position as the Secretary—namely, a person simply attached to the Commission as an expert and assistant without a vote, a great deal of my objection would be removed; but I submit that the Secretary is in a very different position to a member of the Commission who has a right to call evidence and report upon it. Now, Sir, I think the point remains exactly where I left it in spite of the interruption of the right hon. Gentleman—it is a most unfortunate circumstance that on a Commission which is appointed in a City, distracted and torn by religious dissensions, to inquire into religious riots, there should be three of one creed, and one only of the other. I see no reason to doubt that the right hon. Gentleman has shown a most earnest desire to carry out the policy he stated—namely, that of preserving the peace and order of Belfast. Nothing, as I have said, could be further from my thoughts than to cast the slightest doubt upon his *bona fides*; but I know that the right hon. Gentleman is perfectly well aware that a Commission should be appointed which should not only be entitled to the confidence of the community, but which should have nothing about it to excite even an illegitimate spirit of suspicion. I think the Catholics of Belfast will not have any degree of confidence in the Commission. The last addition to the Commission will largely decrease that confidence. If the Commission had been left as it was originally there would have been two Protestants and one Catholic upon it. There are some Catholics in Belfast who would have found some objection even then; but they would have said—"The right hon. Gentleman has left the Commission where it stood; this Commission was appointed by the late Chief Secretary who is in sympathy with us, and therefore it has at least some fair claim to our consideration and respect." But the right hon. Gentleman has made a change in the character and *personnel* of the Commission which was left by his Predecessor; and the change has taken the form of the addition to the Commission of another Protestant, and a Protestant who I may say, without any personal disrespect to him, is very ill fitted for the position. I will say why. Lanarkshire, unfortunately, is one of the districts where we have a repetition of those religious dissensions which exist in Belfast. Unfortunately, some of the Protestants and Catholics have carried into Lanarkshire some of the religious bigotry which I wish to goodness they had left at home, and, consequently, collisions of exactly the same character as those in Belfast are frequent. We have testimony as to the manner in which Captain Wallis M'Hardy has conducted himself in these collisions. Unfortunately the testimony is conflicting. The hon. Gentlemen opposite (Mr. Hozier) spoke, according to his own confession, under the influence of feelings of friendship for persons associated with Captain Wallis M'Hardy. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) said he had consulted several Scotchmen with regard to Captain Wallis M'Hardy. I have consulted several Scotchmen, too, and one Scotch Member has assured me that Captain Wallis M'Hardy is a well-known Orange sympathizer. Well, I think that a police officer who has had to do with Orange-Catholic collisions before, and who has earned the reputation of taking a partial part in deciding upon those conflicts, is the last man in the world you should appoint to a Commission of Inquiry at Belfast.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I should like to say I do not think it is possible to consider that a Commission to inquire into the riots at Belfast composed of three Protestants and one Catholic is a fair Commission. I have not the slightest doubt as to the perfect impartiality of the Commission as it stands, but the Government have to see to more than that. I have known Mr. Adams for many years, and I am persuaded there can be no more impartial member of the Commission than he; and I believe the same can be said of Mr. Trench. But I rose mainly to urge the Government to consider the propriety of adding another Catholic to this Commission. Even then there will be a balance in favour of Protestants; and although, as the House knows, I have tried to put the Protestant view of these riots before the House, I think it is important to create a feeling of confidence in the Commission amongst both Catholics and Protestants. I strongly advise the Government, therefore, to add another Catholic to the Commission.

Mr. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): I think it must be conceded by everyone that the people of Ireland should have confidence in the constitution of this Commission. I do not intend to continue the discussion, but to do that which I think is manifestly right—namely, to move the adjournment of the debate, in order to afford the Government an opportunity of reconsidering this matter.

Mr. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.) seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. E. Harrington.*)

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I hope hon. Members will not insist upon this Motion. We have had a discussion on the general question on which I think my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) quite satisfied the views of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton). Since that time the question of the composition of the Commission has been raised. Of course, as I have already said, the Government are bound in this matter to consider what Commission will give most confidence to the public. We shall take into consideration all that has been said, and we shall do so with the sole desire of constituting a Commission that shall be impartial and that shall receive general approval. That being so, I hope that hon. Members, if they desire, as I believe they desire, that this Bill should proceed, will let it be read a second time to-night. If we are enabled to meet their views, we shall be glad to announce our intention of doing so at a later stage.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S): Undoubtedly the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) did satisfy many of my views, but he certainly did not meet the objection I took to the constitution of the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) has, however, in a few words met us in a reasonable spirit. I certainly give him credit for good faith. I think, when he tells the House that the Government will further consider the question with a view to so constituting the Commission as to command the public confidence, we are entitled to treat such an engagement as meaning more than words. Under the circumstances, I will ask my hon. Friend to withdraw the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and allow the Bill to be read a second time, on the understanding that the Committee stage be deferred for a few days. Perhaps on the Motion that you, Sir, do leave the Chair, the Government will be able to make a further statement.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday*.

METROPOLITAN POOR BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Pickersgill, Bill to amend "The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1870," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Howell, Mr. Buxton, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Montagu, and Mr. James Rowlands.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 44.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 8*th September*, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —NAVY ESTIMATES, Votes 7 to 10 & 13.
Resolutions [September 7] *reported.*

QUESTIONS.

POOR LAW—HOMELESS POOR OF THE METROPOLIS.

MR. PICKERSKILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that a large number of homeless poor, comprising men, women, and children, sleep nightly on the Embankment and other open spaces of the Metropolis; and, if he will make special inquiry to ascertain whether the Guardians of the Metropolitan Unions fulfil all the requirements of the Law as regards providing accommodation for such persons?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Mr. LONG) (Wilts, Devizes) (who replied) said: The Board have no information beyond what has appeared in the newspapers with respect to the number of poor persons who sleep on the Embankment and in the open spaces of the Metropolis. Having referred this morning to the Report of the superintendent visiting officer of vagrant wards for the past month, I find that there are only three wards in which persons have been refused admission. The refusals were only high in number in two cases, respecting both of which the Board have asked for explanations. In all cases of refusal care is taken to ascertain, if the applicants are women or children, whether they are in a fit condition to move on.

THE NORTH SEA FISHERIES CONVENTION—THE PROTECTING CRUISERS.

SIR EDWARD BIRKBECK (Norfolk, E.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, taking into consideration the fact that continued and serious depredations by Foreign trawlers on English drift-net fishing vessels have taken place off the East Coast of England every year from September to Christmas, the losses resulting therefrom amounting to many thousands of pounds, and affecting both owners and fishermen, and that the provisions of the North Sea Fisheries Convention cannot be enforced without a fisherman-pilot being placed on board each of the four Cruisers appointed to protect the fisheries in question, he will agree to give the necessary instructions to engage a fisherman for each of the four Cruisers as an experiment, on the first intimation of depredations being committed, and that the expenses be paid by the Admiralty?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): My hon. Friend has, during the past few years, taken a very leading position in endeavouring to protect the fishermen of the East Coast from depredations committed upon them by the foreign trawlers, and any strong opinion which he may express as to the means most likely to secure that end is entitled to careful consideration. As he knows, last year I endeavoured to improve and extend the protection to which these fishermen were entitled, and the result, I believe, was that last year there were more convictions under the provisions of the North Sea Fisheries Convention than in any previous year. The *Hearty*, a powerful vessel well adapted for this service, is now being fitted out, and will shortly be on the East Coast and on this duty. As regards the suggestion that a fisherman-pilot should be placed on board each of the cruisers, there is an obvious objection to a fisherman-pilot forming part of the complement of such cruisers; but I am quite willing to try the experiment for a month, and will give directions that such pilots should be on board each of the cruisers. I shall thus be able to ascertain whether their presence and local knowledge is of such advantage to the officers in command as to justify a continuation of the arrangement.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NAVY—RETURNS OF SHIPS OF WAR.

OBSERVATIONS.

Sir EDWARD REED (Cardiff) said, before the Speaker left the Chair he wished to call attention to the very unsatisfactory manner in which the Naval Parliamentary Returns to the House were presented. He had detected the grossest inaccuracies in those Returns—inaccuracies which had a very bad appearance, and which were calculated to have very mischievous effects, inasmuch as they favoured conclusions that were known to be foregone conclusions at the Admiralty, and generally made it appear that the Navy of this country was stronger than it was as compared with the Navies of other countries. In this respect he would first say a few words about a Return presented recently, on the Motion of the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford), now one of the Naval Lords of the Admiralty. It was a Return relating to the Fleets of England, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Greece. Everyone who looked at that Return, and remembered the discussions in the last Parliament, would be aware that the noble Lord who moved the Return did so with the patriotic object of bringing before the country the true relative positions of those Navies, both existent and prospective. It would be of great importance if these Returns bore the name and were attested by some other person than the Clerical Secretary to the Admiralty, who could not be expected to guarantee their accuracy from any knowledge of his own. The consequence was that whatever the Departmental people put before the Clerical Secretary came to this House, and the Departmental gentlemen were wholly irresponsible for the Return. He would ask the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to take into consideration the propriety of having the names of a technical officer coupled, if need were, with that of the Clerical Secretary in future Returns of this nature. The noble Lord did not seem disposed to take much notice of this appeal; but if he did not he warned the noble Lord that it would not save any time or enable him to escape from the urgency with which he would press the point. The time had arrived, in his (Sir Edward Reed's) opinion, when hon. Members of this House must refuse to be participators in the exchange of that light coin, "that tinsel clink of compliment" which was continually passing between the two Front Benches of this House, and must go behind and look into the facts for themselves. Now, in this Return there was a great deficiency in a most important particular—namely, that of the Russian Fleet. Either he was inaccurately informed by Russian officers who were well acquainted with the Dockyards and the Navy of Russia, or there were armoured ships of very great importance indeed now constructed by the Russian Government of which no proper note was taken in this Return. He believed that it was equally true of the unarmoured vessels that vessels of considerable importance built for the Russian Government were excluded from the Return. In consequence of such errors as these many hon. Members of the House—and the new Parliament might contain many Members anxious to inform themselves of the facts in relation to the Navy—would be completely misled as to the comparative strength of the Navy if they placed reliance on this Navy Return. That was a very notable fact at a time like the present when, if he was not mistaken, the country would have to consider very seriously the strength of the Russian Navy. Another question had reference to the French Navy, and he invited the particular attention of the House to the illusive system under which the Return was granted. For some reason unknown to himself, except that it might be a wish to defeat the natural desire of the House and the country to understand the real position of the Naval Service, the system of classification adopted was most illusory. He would guard himself on this point, because there was prefixed to the Return a Memorandum, in which hon. Members were told that vessels had been grouped in accordance with the official classification of each country, and that to compare the different Navies correctly the different classifications must be taken into account, adding vessels in some places and deducting them in others on the different lists. But the curious thing was that he found that, whether he took this prefatory Memorandum or the notes attached to the Return, he found that all bore in one direction, that was, to give an exaggerated view of the strength of our own Navy and a view of foreign Navies that did not realize the true position and character of those Navies. Could anything be more serious than that in a Return made to Parliament; and was he not justified in interposing at this moment and commending the matter to the attention of the noble Lord? He found that in the classification of our ships, whenever boilers were protected by deck armour, although the vessel's side was not protected, she was taken out of the category of unarmoured and put into the armoured or protected class. There was a class of vessels now building for which he was entitled to claim considerable credit—he alluded to the belted cruisers. Part of the extended programme of Lord Northbrook was the adoption of five belted cruisers. These ships, which had belts, and were to that extent armoured, came at once into the category of armoured vessels; but in the Return no distinction was made between them and the fully armoured ships of the Navy. He confessed that these belted cruisers were much better protected than many of the large iron-clads; but they had no protection at all to their guns, and he thought they should be classed as armoured belted cruisers. A question arose on the previous night in a debate about certain vessels armed with long modern guns, and there seemed to be an idea in some quarters of the House that there was not much difference between barbette and turret vessels; but the distinction was that the turret guns were protected, while the barbette guns were not. If no exception had been taken to this Return they should have had the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton), or some other hon. Member of the House, totalling up the tonnage of these ships as so much armoured tonnage, and never reflecting or considering that in such a method of procedure as that they might get figures to show anything. The noble Lord would do well to withdraw this Return and give it to the House in a complete form—a Return which, at any rate, would be correct as far as it went. He had called attention to this as a specimen of the general system of presenting Returns that were quite misleading. He did not know how it could be dealt with—not by the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) pressed with the multifarious duties of his Office, nor by the Secretary (Mr. Forwood); but he had thrown out the suggestion that the responsibility of inaccuracies should be fixed upon some one, and the independence of the House should be vindicated, not leaving hon. Members to the dangers of accepting misleading Returns of this nature.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said, he wished to call the attention of the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to the fact that in the Egyptian and Soudan Campaigns there were similar defects in the Transport Service and arrangements of the Navy as those in the Army to which he had called attention on the previous evening. For instance, for the purpose of landing heavy stores in Egypt a very large pair of shears was constructed in England—so large that its component parts had to be taken out in two vessels, the result being that one leg was landed at its destination, where it lay utterly useless, and the other left at home, where, he believed, it was still to be seen. In addition to this, a composite pier was constructed for the landing of stores in Egypt, and a number of men were drilled in the work of putting the pier together; but the pieces being sent out in slow-steaming vessels did not arrive until after all the stores had been landed at another place than that at which the pier was to have been erected. Again, with regard to medicines that were sent out in large consignments, they could not be found when wanted; but in one ship the medicine chests were discovered crushed beneath some tons of flour, which, however, was not damaged thereby, inasmuch as it was reported to be unfit for use before it left England. Beyond this, quantities of sugar, tea, and other necessaries were put into a heavy vessel under heavy gun carriages, and could not be got at until it was too late for their use on board. On another vessel the sugar and tea intended for the troops was so carefully stowed away that no amount of search was able to discover their whereabouts until after the campaign was over. He was desirous of obtaining from the Government some assurance that the extraordinary occurrences and failures which had happened during those campaigns should not again take place, and that every endeavour would be made to prevent the possibility of any recurrence of such things.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) said, he had to complain of the way in which business was conducted at the Admiralty, and of the system under which ships were designed and built, and thought that more information should be laid before the House, so that Parliament should be able to exercise more control. He suggested that a Royal Commission or a Committee of the House should be appointed to consider the designs upon which the ships of the Navy were being built, and also as to the general condition of the Service. He had also to complain of the Mediterranean Squadron being taken on what appeared to be yachting excursions to Alexandria and other places, instead of the ships being utilized for the education of the men on board in torpedo and gunnery exercise, and the Service generally. He alleged that instruction in drill was not efficient, and that when vessels were sent round the stations it was looked upon as a huge holiday.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton) said, he desired to remove a very erroneous impression that seemed to have got possession of the hon. Member for Sutherland (Mr. Gourley). He could assure that hon. Gentleman that on all occasions gunnery, torpedo, and ordinary exercises were most carefully carried out in the Mediterranean Squadron. Journals of these matters were carefully kept by the commanders of the vessels and submitted to the Admiral, and these were afterwards forwarded to the Admiralty; and if anything wrong appeared there, any neglect of ordinary or extraordinary exercises, the responsible officer was pretty sure to be reminded of it. But there was an old adage too often forgotten in our censure of other people's duties, that "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy;" and depend upon it, if our seamen, marines, and boys were carefully educated—he might almost say over-educated—according to the requirements of the Service; if, from the Commander-in-Chief downwards, the work was done as the Admiralty, no doubt, had reason to believe it was done, then a certain amount of liberty was the necessary accompaniment. The hon. Member should bear in mind that ships were sent to foreign stations with more objects than one, and one object was to keep up the *entente cordiale* which ought to exist between pepole on shore and officers and men afloat. It would be a very hard case if, when the Squadron was off the coast of Syria, a little leave and license should not be allowed men who desired to make a visit to the Holy Land. From time immemorial such leave had been granted in the Service, and there was really no reason to depart from the precedents. There was no officer in the Navy who, with those attributes of command that required any man under him to do his work, was more willing to allow opportunities for relaxation than H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh. In reference to the *Impérieuse*, he quite agreed that she was among the most complete failures of modern ships. Badly designed, and badly carried out; such vessels were absolutely dangerous. As an ocean cruiser, what was the use of a ship designed to carry 400 tons of coal, a quantity that at full speed would only last her a day and a-half, and, the supply being exhausted, she had nothing to rely upon—absolutely nothing? Every able constructor, every Controller of the Navy knows, as every sailor knows, that a vessel with double screws is unmanageable under sail. You may increase the speed by a knot or two by supplementing steam with sail; but under sail only such a vessel would be useless and unsafe. In reference to the two ships, the *Impérieuse* and the *Warspite*, he last year asked that a Committee of naval and constructive experts should consider and report what in their judgment was the best thing to be done with the ships. His own idea—and he knew it was shared by a large number of naval officers of experience and knowledge that made their opinion valuable—was that the masts and yards should be taken out of them, the upper deck should be removed, and they should be turned into coast defence vessels, for which purpose they would be fairly useful. It was impossible to combine the two things—sailing, with the double screws. He would say nothing against the advantage of double screws as such; but if a spar or hawser, or any of the sailing gear happened to go over the side and fouled the screws, then the latter would become entirely useless. He trusted the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) would boldly face the question, and have the position of the double-screw vessels carefully considered, and also with regard to those not yet fully rigged. The result, he was strongly of opinion, would be a recommendation that the masts and yards should be removed, and the ships converted into fighting turrets for coast defence under steam. He was not quite certain that a Royal Commission was the best means of arriving at a decision. Commissions usually collected a great amount of evidence, and presented a long-winded Report, and that was all. But some means should be adopted for arriving at the best thing to be done for our fighting ships and cruisers, for at present the Navy was in a most unsatisfactory state—we were, in fact, living in a fool's paradise. Vessels that on the measured mile had been certified to do 12 knots could not really do more than 10. The measured mile trial, in fact, was quite fallacious. Under the most favourable circumstances of first-class picked coal, engineers and stokers specially trained, they got the best possible results out of the trial and produced a good result; but, as was known from particular instances, this was done sometimes by the trick of bottling up the steam until the last moment. The speed test was a fallacy, and never in ordinary service was the measured mile rate realized. In the case of the *Northampton* the speed put down was 13½ knots, and an expenditure of 250 tons; but all he could say was that in a three years' commission, and with the greatest possible care, he could never get out of her more than 11½ knots. The *Impérieuse* would burn the same amount of coal, for though she was more modern, longer, and with engines compounded in a different manner, he did not hesitate to say that, though on the measured mile test she was put down at 17 knots, she would in commission drift into a 15 knot vessel.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing) said, he was much obliged to the hon. and gallant Member for Southampton (Sir John Commerell) for the practical suggestions he had made. With regard to the *Impérieuse*, he was quite aware that a grave miscalculation had been made. It had for some time past been the practice of the Constructors' Department to estimate the speed of a new vessel with what was called only her "legend" weights aboard. These legend weights only include a certain proportion of the coal the ship could carry; and the trials of speed were, therefore, carried out without all the weights being aboard, which the vessel, when ready for service, would carry. This practice led to deceptive statements being made concerning the speed and coal endurance of new ships. The *Impérieuse* was publicly stated to be able to either steam 17 knots for so many hundred miles, or, at a lower rate of speed, to have a coal endurance of so many thousand miles. If the vessel, however, had all her weights aboard, she would not be able to steam 17 knots; if she was not loaded up to her full coal-carrying capacity she would not have the coal endurance claimed for her. The belt and portholes of the *Impérieuse* were, when she was fully loaded, nearly two feet deeper immersed than was anticipated. They had, however, taken steps by which in future all trials of speed would be made with all weights aboard, and the trial was to be of a more thorough and lengthened character than before. By these steps they would prevent the difference between the designed draught and the actual draught which had occurred in the past; and the speed obtained at the trials would not be a fancy speed, but that which the vessel, when commissioned, can accomplish. The *Impérieuse*, though deeper in her draught by two feet than designed, would be a powerful and effective man-of-war. She was now on an experimental cruise under Captain Fane; and he had little doubt that the result of that cruise would be that her heavy spars and bolts would be removed, and a considerable gain in weight achieved. In reply to the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh), he might say that the subjects the hon. Member referred to, as to recent experiences in Egypt, were matters of Parliamentary investigation; and it would be the duty of his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) and himself (Lord George Hamilton) to see whether they could not institute a better system of organization, by which stores intended for the benefit and comfort of troops should be made more readibly accessible; and he agreed that where expensive plant was taken out to assist any expedition in which Her Majesty's Forces were engaged abroad it was essential that when not required it should be returned home or placed in some appropriate position. The hon. Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) alluded to one of the Returns presented to the House in regard to foreign Navies as being misleading; but the hon. Member did not give them any facts in support of his assertion, but seemed to base it upon the assumption that certain Russian vessels were not included in the Returns. He quite agreed with the hon. Member that all the Returns should, as far as possible, be accurate; but in this instance it should be remembered it was a Return made at the request of the House of Commons, and, therefore, was not a classification by the Admiralty; consequently, if there was any error, it was entirely due to those who obtained it for the House of Commons. He denied that there was any mis-statement in the description or classification; and the hon. Gentleman (Sir Edward Reed), who had special means of information, and had been informed by Russian officers that this Return was misleading, should have had it rectified or withdrawn. The Return in question was given by the late Government, being moved for on the 23rd March, and granted on the 17th May, 1886; and the hon. Gentleman was a Member of the Government, and specially attached to the Admiralty in order that they might have the benefit of his knowledge.

Sir EDWARD REED (Cardiff) said, that he never saw the Return until a short time ago; and at the time referred to he had no more to do with the Admiralty than the noble Lord. It did not lie with him, as a Lord of the Treasury, to revise such Returns.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, that, at all events, the hon. Member was in Office when the Return was laid on the Table of the House, and from his special knowledge he had the opportunity of informing his Colleagues that the Return was misleading, and therefore ought to be withdrawn. He was quite aware there was a tendency in certain quarters to assume that whoever was at the Admiralty was inclined to over-estimate the fighting power of our Navy, and under-estimate that of foreign countries. What the Admiralty had to do was to place as fairly and as accurately as they could before the House all the information in their possession, and draw as fair a comparison as they could between the relative strength of the Navies of the world. In discussing these Estimates they were anxious to have the advantage of any practical question raised by any hon. Members; but, as far as the discussion had now gone, he thought it was of a nature that would be more advantageously disposed of when the House had gone into Committee.

Mr. R. W. DUFF (Banffshire) said, that as the late Board of Admiralty were answerable for the Return commented upon by his hon. Friend the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) he wished to make a few observations. The question was raised as to foreign vessels by the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford); and the reply of the late Government was that they were unable to give absolutely full information respecting foreign Navies, but that they would furnish the best at their command. The Lords of the Admiralty went for information to the Heads of the Departments, and on the occasion referred to the person who supplied the information was Captain Kane, Naval Attaché to Foreign Countries; and, on the whole, he believed that the information so obtained was accurate, and he must protest against the assumption by his hon. Friend (Sir Edward Reed) that the Returns were cooked by the Admiralty.

Sir EDWARD REED said, it had not been his intention to make any such suggestion. He did not think the blame lay with the Board of Admiralty, but with the people who were behind them.

Mr. R. W. DUFF said, they gave the best information in their power, and in regard to the question of under-rating the interest of the Admiralty was rather to over-rate the strength of Foreign Powers, but not of our own. Any Return presented to Parliament was presented on the responsibility of the Admiralty; and he was sure that no First Lord, or other Member of the Board, would wish to throw the responsibility upon any of their subordinates. In a large Return like that dealing with foreign Navies there might be inaccuracies, and that was pointed out to the noble Lord (Lord Charles Beresford) when the Return was presented; but, on the whole, he believed it was correct. With regard to the remark that fell from the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton), respecting the *Impérieuse,* he thought that the policy of the present Admiralty was a very wise one; that the policy of sending her on a cruise for the purpose of testing her was an exceedingly good one; and when she returned again to Portsmouth he believed they would have to take from her the enormous masts, and that she would then prove a satisfactory vessel. One other subject he would like to refer to was the Report which was of considerable interest to the Naval Service—he meant the Report of the Committee that had considered for a period of 18 months the question of the education of naval officers.

MR. SPEAKER said, that the question the hon. Member was now about to enter upon did not refer to any of the Estimates about to be taken.

MR. R. W. DUFF said, he was merely going to ask the noble Lord if he had any objection to present the Report; but he would not press the subject further; and he would only say that, so far as the policy indicated by the noble Lord was sketched out, he thought it bore out the policy of the noble Lord's Predecessors, and, so far as he knew, was an entirely satisfactory one, and would have the support of the late Board.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport) said, the House was naturally concerned to know who was responsible for the inaccuracies in the Return. He considered that his noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) was somewhat hard on the hon. Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed), because if he was correct the Return in question was not circulated before the Dissolution of Parliament. It was ordered to be printed before the Dissolution; but he did not think that hon. Members got possession of it until after the Dissolution. Therefore the hon. Member for Cardiff could not have had it till recently. The late Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. R. W. Duff) had stated that one of the reasons for the inaccuracies in the Return might possibly have been owing to the fact that the Admiralty were not in a position to give accurate information as to the ships possessed by Foreign Powers. A fact of that kind probably lay at the root of the whole question; and when the Vote came on he should point out to the Committee how necessary it was that the Government should obtain this particular kind of information — with reference to the existence and building of war ships in foreign countries — by appointing a stronger staff of officers in the Intelligence Department.

MR. PEARCE (Lanark, Govan) said, he did not know whether he was in Order; but he wished to call attention to the Returns moved for by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Forwood), as to the number of merchant vessels engaged by the Admiralty for the purpose of being converted into cruisers last year. The amount paid last year for these vessels was £535,000; and he wished to know whether any provision had been made in the present Estimates, or whether such provision was contemplated in any future Estimates, in order to meet the employment of this class of ship in the future? To him it was very clear that it was necessary for this country to have fast cruisers in the Merchant Service. At the present time they had vessels crossing the Atlantic at 19 knots an hour, and it would be the aim of Foreign Powers to get these vessels for the purpose of improving their own Fleets, which would naturally be to the disadvantage of the Fleet of this country. He thought it would be of considerable importance to the Navy if they could always rely upon having from 10 to 20 fast steamers of the Merchant Service in the hands of the Admiralty; and this could be done by subsidizing them. He would, therefore, propose to the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) that a Committee should be appointed to take into consideration the requirements of fast cruisers, their rate of speed, and how they could be best adapted for, and made use of, in time of war.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. FORWOOD) (Lancashire, Ormskirk) said, the hon. Member for the Govan Division of Lanarkshire (Mr. Pearce) had raised a question of very considerable interest, and one that was engaging the attention of the Admiralty at the present moment. The large sum of money paid last year for the retention of a number of merchant cruisers had drawn the attention of the Admiralty to the importance of considering how far preparation could be made in advance for the employment of that class of vessels, instead of being obliged to take them up—he would not say in an indiscriminate manner, but in a hasty manner, such as was the case last year. Communications had been made to the Board by the owners of large vessels of exceptional speed as to their building vessels of exceptional speed suitable for cruisers, and the Board of Admiralty are now considering the whole question. He might say, on behalf of his noble Friend the First Lord (Lord George Hamilton), that any suggestions from the owners of steamers at present in existence of exceptional speed, and suitable for cruisers, or from those who contemplated building such vessels, would be gladly accepted by the Admiralty for consideration.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £69,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of the Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I find, under this head, an item of £500 a-year, the salary of the Superintending Civil Engineer for the Victualling Yard at Haulbowline, together with £100 as a special allowance for superintending the works, which is to cease on their completion. I desire to draw the attention of the First of the Admiralty to the way in which the contracts in connection with the Victualling Yards are given out, and particularly to the contracts for mess pork, which I think could be much better obtained at home than abroad. Unfortunately, a system prevails at present of contracting for supplies in foreign ports, although the same supply could be obtained cheaper and much better at home. At the present time the Navy are being supplied with mess pork from Hamburg, while quite as good food could be supplied more readily and cheaply from Ireland. What is the result of that system? It is that establishments from which we ought to obtain a supply at home have been starved out of existence. I am not old enough to recollect all the incidents of the Crimean Campaign; but I have conversed with men who were both at home and abroad at the time of that campaign; and I believe it is a matter of tradition, especially in connection with the Army stores, that the stores and food supplied to those who were engaged in the campaign were of a very inferior quality. What could have been expected under the existing system, when food supplies were wanted in an emergency? We possessed no establishments which were accustomed to bear so sudden a strain on their resources, owing to the habit which had grown up of neglecting them in a time of peace. The number of tradesmen who could be employed in making up the supply are necessarily limited. The trade of the coopers, for instance, is a close Corporation, and they keep the work entirely for themselves. I have heard stories of the manner in which the supplies were made up, some of which were altogether laughable and ridiculous. I have heard of a tradesman who declined to walk from one store to another, and demanded that a carriage should be sent to convey him. That may appear very absurd on the face of it; but there was some reason in it. Wages went up to an extraordinary figure; in fact, almost any price could be obtained that might be asked; and in this instance the tradesman calculated that he would have lost 20*s.* while he was walking from one store to another. As to the workmen, they were employed until they became positively exhausted, and some of them fell down prostrate over their work. Under these circumstances, a great amount of bad work was done, and the disasters in connection with the Crimean Campaign occurred in consequence; all because the Government, owing to some infatuation, would continue to give contracts outside the Three Kingdoms; and consequently when a strain came they had no establishment that was accustomed to the turning out of supplies in good working order. This was the case not only with regard to the supply of mess pork, but with other food supplies. We have here on the Front Bench a number of noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen to answer questions put to them by Members; but they are supplied with their information from other sources, and I always view with suspicion the evasive answers which are returned in reference to this subject of the contracts for food supplies. They remind me of the truth of a saying of Talleyrand—that words were invented for the purpose of concealing thoughts. Many of the answers we get from the Treasury Bench are of that character, and whenever I hear of a contract being sent abroad my suspicions are aroused. I may add that the facts, when they become known, very often bear out my suspicions. It must be borne in mind that the answers to these questions are frequently supplied from an interested source. I believe that Her Majesty's Ministers do not investigate far enough into the organization of their Departments. I believe that if they did they would find that many of the officials have a special interest in procuring contracts for foreign firms. I know that many establishments in Ireland have been starved out. There were splendid establishments in Cork and Tralee which did a large business during the Crimean War, but which are now absolutely closed. I wish to impress upon the noble and gallant Lord opposite (Lord Charles Beresford) and the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) that it is their duty to look closely into this matter of food contracts, and to do all they can in support of native sources of supply. Why should it be necessary to go outside this country for a supply? Take the case of mess pork. Why should the Government want to go out of Ireland for a supply of that article? It has often been said that the pig is almost indigenous to the soil of Ireland; that Ireland is the home of the pig; that the pig is the friend of the family; and that he pays the rent and the taxes. He ought also to fulfil another duty—namely, that of supplying the Navy with pork, which could easily be done if the unlimited resources of Ireland were called into existence. I wish to impress that point upon the noble Lord, and also upon right hon. Gentlemen who sit with him on the Front Bench. I do not think we ought to be satisfied with their coming down here and giving us evasive answers on these subjects, in regard to which we are probably better posted than themselves. All that we desire is to receive plain and straightforward answers; but I am afraid that will never be the case until Ministers go back to their Departments and thoroughly investigate their organization to the bottom. There is also another matter connected with this Vote upon which I ask for information. There is a Superintending Civil Engineer at £500 a-year, with a special allowance of £100 a-year until the completion of the works now going on at Haulbowline. I should very much like to know when the works at Haulbowline are going to be completed? I was down there the other day, and I found them in a very incomplete state. A leak had been sprung at the head of the dry dock, which has resulted in the curtailment of the length of the dock by, I believe, 67 feet. A good deal of money has been spent there, although the works have been carried out, in a great measure, by convict labour. I presume that many hon. Members have seen Cork Harbour. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty has been there and inspected these Docks to my knowledge. The year before last the noble Lord visited this establishment, as well as the Victoria Docks at Passage, and he himself has seen the capabilities of the harbour. Cork Harbour is one of the finest harbours in the world. It seems to have been specially designed by nature for the security and protection of the entire Fleet of England. We boast in the City of Cork that our harbour is capable of receiving upon its bosom, and of affording protection to, the entire Fleet. The country has built at an enormous cost two of the finest seaports in the world. We have recently spent £1,000,000 on the Camden Fort, and another £1,000,000 is in course of expenditure on the Carlisle Fort. Not only is Cork Harbour a safe harbour, but it is a very beautiful harbour; it is highly picturesque, and there is good anchorage there—perhaps, after Bantry Bay, the best anchorage in the world. Then, again, it is a most safe harbour. Long before you built these forts, and even, I believe, before the harbour came into your possession, the arms of Cork indicated its security. The arms of Cork are represented by two forts with a ship sailing in between them safe and sound. The motto of the City is *statio bene fida carinis.* We take a special interest in this harbour and in seeing the docks finally completed; and if possible another Estimate should be asked for next year in order to carry out an original plan of making a second dry dock. You have spoilt, to a great extent, the one upon which you have already been at work by defective engineering, and I am very much afraid that you will not be able to remedy your bad work. We entertain the hope that at no very distant date we shall have greater interest in the maintenance and security of your Navy than we have at present. We believe that the relations of the two countries will be on such a footing as to induce us to take greater pride in your Army and Navy, and greater interest than we take now. I believe they will be in the mind of every Irishman as much his Army and Navy, and as much for his protection as for yours. We are, therefore, anxious that you should complete this work as quickly as possible, taking into account the great advantage to be derived to the Navy from the Harbour of Cork, and that you intend to rely upon it as a harbour of refuge. That that is so is proved by the fact that you have already erected there two of the strongest forts in the world; yet at the same time you are paying out, with a very niggardly hand, the taxes of the country that must necessarily be spent in order to make these works complete. You may be glad some day to have these docks, and at no very distant date it may be a matter of regret that you did not push on with the works in a manner more becoming the requirements of the case. There was a time when this Harbour of Cork, even without its forts, rendered you incalculable service. I presume that the reputation of Admiral Drake is unsullied, and yet that famous Commander was very glad to take refuge in Cork Harbour; and we point out with pride a spot in a little river which flows into the harbour, almost at its mouth, and which we call "Drake's Pool," where Drake lay concealed. It is round a corner in the rear of the Camden Fort, and Admiral Drake sailed round that corner into this little creek with his Fleet, and there remained safe and sound while the Spaniards explored every part of the harbour, and failed to find him. Yet, with all these natural advantages, the Admiralty and the Government of England, with their usual niggardliness where the expenditure of money in Ireland is concerned, have been carrying on this work for many years by convict labour; and now that the convicts have been dispersed they will not hasten the completion of the works. And why? I presume it is owing to their fear that they may have to erect stores and supply them with engines and machinery. Of course, as soon as the docks are completed it will be impossible to allow them to remain idle, and the Government will be obliged to get a portion of the naval construction and repairs done in Cork Harbour. I cannot help thinking that the starvation system hitherto adopted has been altogether unworthy of Her Majesty's Government. Why should not Ireland be treated on a footing of equality with other parts of the Kingdom in this respect? We have heard professions from successive Governments with regard to Ireland, that they are going to develop her industrial resources, to give her ameasure of self-government, or something of some sort or other. They are always going to do something, but they never do anything. This has been the case in regard to the Haulbowline Docks, and I would press upon the Government the desirableness of hastening on the works, so that a portion of the Imperial expenditure may be applied to Ireland, and the reproach which has been made against successive Governments who have dealt with the subject may be removed. I have now raised two questions under this Vote in regard to the contracts, and I have endeavoured to sustain my remarks by arguments that appertain to the interests of the Public Service. I trust that we may hear no more evasive answers from the noble Lord, or whoever may occupy the noble Lord's position in future, but that the organization of the Departments will be investigated down to the very bottom, so that hereafter the contracts may be given out fairly, and for the advantage of the Public Service. I would also suggest that in the course of the autumn the members of the Board of Admiralty should visit Cork Harbour on their round of inspection, as they have done before, with a view of hastening on the works at Haulbowline, and of giving to Cork that due share of work to which it is entitled by its natural resources, and by reason of the fact that Ireland contributes so largely to the Imperial Exchequer.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (A LORD of the ADMIRALTY) (Marylebone, E.): I will answer the remarks of the hon. Member as far as the Victualling Department is concerned, and as far as I am able. The hon. Member spoke of evasive answers. I imagine that he refers to an answer given to a Question the other day, relative to some food supplies to the Channel Fleet.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.); I did not refer particularly to that answer.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: I think that is the only answer I have given; but as the Victualling Yards come under my Department I will not give an evasive, but a straight answer upon the subject. The question of tenders for contracts is a very important question from two points of view. One is, that we must get the best article; and the other is, that the price should not be too high. The Admiralty endeavour, first of all, to consider how good the article is, or whether it is good enough; and, secondly, the question of price. The hon. Member has spoken about the contracts for pork. I may tell him that the merchants in Ireland have always been invited to tender for pork. Only a few months ago contracts were put out for Deptford and Haulbowline, and the reason why an Irish firm was accepted as contractor for Haulbowline was that the price was the lowest price tendered and the pork was good; but in regard to Deptford the Irish firm asked 17*s.* 6*d.* more per tierce of 200 lbs. than a Danish firm, and, therefore, the tender of the Danish firm was taken. I may say with regard to this question of contracts that when they come before the Admiralty and are discussed there is a large amount of inquiry as to whether, in the interests of the Public Service, foreign firms ought to be accepted against English firms. It is the wish of the Admiralty always to accept an English firm and home produce in preference to a foreign firm, providing the article is of the same quality and the price is fair. In one of the Minutes recently passed in connection with the Contract Department it is proposed that in future, whenever we take a contract from a foreign firm, which is also tendered for by a home firm, the reason why the foreign firm has been accepted in preference to the home firm shall always be placed on paper. I cannot answer the question asked by the hon. Member in reference to the works at Haulbowline, because they will come under another Vote.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): One word in explanation. The prices tendered for by the Danish firm in the instance referred to by the noble and gallant Lord for mess pork ranged from 50*s.* to 56*s.*, while the tenders of the Irish firm were from 52*s.* to 72*s.*; so that the difference between some of the prices was not very considerable. These are the market prices—the highest quotations of the market.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD: The hon. Member may be correct in saying that they were the prices in the trade; but they were not the prices in the tender offered to the Admiralty.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): I would ask the Admiralty to take into consideration the desirability of issuing cocoa or other rations to men who have to get up early in the morning. When men have to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning in tropical climates it is necessary that they should not be left without food; and if rations were issued earlier I believe there would be greater advantage so far as the vitality of the men is concerned, and there would not be such a severe strain upon the Medical Establishment owing to the number of invalids thrown upon their hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and gallant Member is out of Order in discussing the rations of the men. This is the Victualling Yards Vote, and not a Vote for victuals, which is contained in another Vote.

MR. P. McDONALD (Sligo, N.): I am much pleased to have heard the explanation given by the noble and gallant Lord to my hon. Friend the Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor). The subject is one to which I drew attention last Session. I refer to the Return under the head of contracts with foreigners; and on the face of that Return I find, somewhat to my surprise, that under the head of salt pork and preserved butter——

THE CHAIRMAN: The observation which I have already made to the hon.

and gallant Admiral applies also to the question which the hon. Member for Sligo proposes to discuss. It comes under a different Vote altogether, this being a Vote for the Victualling Yards.

Mr. P. McDONALD: Then I will raise the question again on Report.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): In respect of the Vote we are now asked to pass, there is one portion of it which I should like to bring under the notice of the Government—namely, the works at the Haulbowline Victualling Yard. I believe they have already been brought under the attention of the present and of the late Government and that they have also engaged the attention of many other successive Governments. Indeed, Haulbowline has been a sort of stumbling block to English Governments as they have succeeded each other. It has also been expected that something was going to be done to hasten on the works at Haulbowline, and by making Haulbowline complete to convert Queen'stown Harbour into what it is really intended to be by nature.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. Member that the Vote for the works at Haulbowline is Vote 11, and his observations must be confined to the Victualling Yard only.

Dr. TANNER: It is in connection with the Victualling Yard that I am about to speak. I am going to move that the Vote be reduced by the amount of the salary of the Superintending Civil Engineer—namely, £500, and the special allowance to him of £100, which is to cease on the completion of the works. If the Committee will allow me to say so, it is palpable, even to the most superficial observer, that this special allowance to this gentleman makes it to his interest to delay the completion of the works. I wish the Committee to consider how the works are being proceeded with, and if the Engineer is not superintending them properly then this Vote ought to be disallowed; and I shall certainly take a division if I receive no satisfactory assurance that the First Lord of the Admiralty and right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench will take the subject into their serious consideration. I see from the Votes for Victualling Yards that the total sum for the Haulbowline Yard is £3,644, whereas the amount spent at Plymouth is £12,600; at Gosport, £13,595; and at Deptford, £32,632. Now, I think it will be readily seen that Ireland has not been properly treated in this matter. Of this large sum of money more than £58,000 is being spent in connection with Victualling Yards at home in England, while only the miserable sum of £3,644 is spent at Haulbowline. I think that is neither fair nor just. Haulbowline is an Island in Cork Harbour, and Cork Harbour was certainly intended by nature to be, as its motto—*statio bene fida carinis*—implies, capable of taking in all Her Majesty's Fleet, and therefore the establishment ought to be much better looked after. Some mention has been made of the supply of butter and butterine in connection with the Department represented by the noble and gallant Lord. I think we are justified in connecting the name of butter with the Admiralty procedure generally in connection with this establishment at Haulbowline. In the South of Ireland there is a saying that not unfrequently the English Government, in order to promote their own ends, are accustomed to treat the Irish Members in this way. First of all, "to butter them up in order the better to slither them down." On the part of my hon. Friends who sit on this side of the House I may say that we decline to be "slithered down," and we hope the noble and gallant Lord and the First Lord will take the matter into their serious consideration with the view of remedying the evils of which we complain. I must also say that all the advantages which Queenstown Harbour possesses as a Victualling Yard have not had due attention paid to them. In the first place, the harbour is capacious enough to take in the whole of the English Fleet, and possibly another Fleet as well. The hon. Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) has told the Committee how Admiral Drake once sailed in there and found refuge when running away from the Spanish Fleet. Of course, at that time the harbour was not so well defended as it is now. The shelter afforded by Queenstown Harbour is second to that of no other harbour in the world. Furthermore, it is one of the most westerly harbours in Europe, and that also enhances its importance considerably. Added to that the depth of water in

Queenstown Harbour is second to that of no other harbour in Europe. Respecting the item in the Vote of £500 to the Superintending Civil Engineer with a special allowance of £100 to cease on the completion of the works, I have to say that, notwithstanding the answer given to a Question recently addressed to the Treasury Bench, the dry dock at Haulbowline, which this gentleman has had under his superintendence, has sprung a leak. The leak has been patched up to a certain extent; but it has not been effectually cured or stopped, and the consequence is that the works there have been materially delayed. Again, complaints have been made of the river entrance to the Dock which this gentleman has to superintend. The shipwrights have complained from time to time that the works are not being proceeded with as they ought to be, and that an insufficient number of men are employed. My attention has also been called to the fact that the men employed there are being discharged day by day. It appears to me that the Government have been carrying out in connection with the works at Haulbowline a policy of procrastination, and I think a policy of procrastination ought to be thoroughly condemned. Any attempt to make a scape-goat of this gentleman would be highly culpable on the part of the Government; but, unfortunately, the only person we can deal with happens to be the Engineer, and certainly strong complaints have been made as to the way in which he has done his work. There is a further point in regard to this Dock. I understand that the engine-house which has been erected has been suffered to get altogether out of repair. Taking the work which has been done there as a whole, I think it cannot be condemned too strongly; and now that I see upon the Treasury Bench a noble and gallant Lord whose name has been handed down to fame in connection with the Royal Navy, and I know further that that noble and gallant Lord happens to be an Irishman, I entertain the strongest hope that in Ireland we may in future find greater attention paid to the construction of reproductive works. I beg to move that the Vote be reduced by the amount of £500—the salary of the Superintending Civil Engineer, together with the item of £100 as an allowance.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £69,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of the Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."—(*Dr. Tanner.*)

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I cheerfully support my hon. Friend in the Motion he has made, because it appears to me that the whole policy of the Government in regard to Haulbowline, and in respect of this particular officer, is a mischievous one. It appears that this gentleman has been employed in superintending the construction of these works since 1855—going on now for 21 years, and the works themselves do not appear to be much nearer completion than they were within 12 months of the commencement. Why is this? It is because you put a premium on delay. As soon as the works are completed, this gentleman's salary, and £100 besides his pay, will come to an end; and he is, therefore, interested in making as little advance with the works as possible. His chief interest is merely to make a show of doing something, but to employ as small a number of men under him as will secure him from official censure. The result of this system of paying a man for delay is that you have kept at Haulbowline a number of men—whose wages are also given in this Vote—evidently so ridiculously small as to indicate the intention of the Government that nothing effective shall be done. On the same page as this officer's salary appears there is a charge for the wages of 10 men on the establishment, and eight hired artificers and labourers. Is it not evidently a mere farce to have 10 established men and eight hired labourers to complete these enormous works that were commenced in 1855? If we compare the policy of the Government with regard to other Victualling Yards in the same Vote the disparity appears very striking. In the first of these Yards—namely, Deptford, you have no less than 375 men engaged, 194 being on the establishment, and 181 being hired artificers and labourers, and there you have no such works to carry out. There can be no pretence that you have at Deptford works at all similar to those supposed to be making progress under this Superintending Civil Engineer at Haulbowline. Then at the

Royal Clarence Yard at Gosport you have 75 men on the establishment, and 41 hired artificers and labourers; making 116 altogether. There, also, you have no such works as those which are in progress at Haulbowline, yet the number of men employed, both on the establishment and hired, is immensely greater than at the Victualling Yard at Haulbowline. Then, again, if you go to the third of the Victualling Yards of Great Britain—the Royal William Yard at Plymouth—you will find that 65 workmen are employed on the establishment, with hired artificers and labourers to the number of 36—making 101 altogether. Why is this? It is because this is really a Yard which is kept in proper working order by the Government; and, therefore, more than 100 men are employed constantly, although no works are in progress at all similar to those which the Superintending Engineer of Haulbowline is supposed to be pushing forward. The whole policy of appointing officers with an amount of pay that is to terminate on the completion of certain work is, of course, calculated to defeat the object the Government pretend to have in view. It is, however, all of a piece with the general system of the treatment of Ireland by the Admiralty. If hon. Members will look through the whole of the Estimates, it will be found that just as in this Vote the policy of the Government is to spend all the money necessary to keep up the naval resources of this country, or upon places abroad, they starve Ireland as much as possible, making only the ridiculous pretence of giving her something like a share in the distribution of public money in connection with this institution at Haulbowline. Now, Sir, the administration of this Vote is strikingly unfair to Ireland. You have no Dockyard at all, and only this one Victualling Yard; whereas on the South Coast of England you have no less than three. There are along the coast of Ireland places eminently fit for Victualling Yards, or institutions of that kind, where, at present, there is nothing of the sort. I may instance the Port of Galway. That is a place upon which the Admiralty ought to spend a large sum of money under the head of this Vote. It is a railway terminus, with a magnificent bay affording refuge from the storms of the Atlantic. It is in the extreme west of the coast-line of the Kingdom, and in the centre of an agricultural district from which stores could be readily drawn if any institution of this kind were established for the purpose. In order to protest against the unfair treatment which Ireland has received, not only under this head, but generally in regard to Admiralty administration, I shall certainly support my hon. Friend in the reduction of the Vote which he has moved.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Civil Lord of the Admiralty) (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I wish to explain that the artificers and labourers included in the Vote for the Victualling Department at Haulbowline are not employed in the construction of the Dockyard works.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: They are put down for Haulbowline in the same way that they are put down for the other Victualling Yards. The only complaint I make is that you have a certain number of men put down for Haulbowline who are evidently inadequate to do anything like effective work; whereas in the English Victualling Yards you have hundreds of men at your service.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): I wish to explain that the salary of the Superintending Civil Engineer for Haulbowline ought to have been charged in Vote 11, and that it only appears here owing to some misconception. This Vote has reference simply to the maintenance of the Victualling Yard at Haulbowline, and has nothing to do with the construction of the Dockyard works. The Engineer, however, has to look after the buildings in the Victualling Yard as well as in the Dockyard, and the artificers and labourers included in the Vote are simply those who perform ordinary duties connected with the Victualling Yard. They have no connection whatever with the engineering works going on in the Haulbowline Dockyard. The hon. Gentleman has objected to the sum of money spent in the Haulbowline Victualling Yard as compared with the expenditure in the Yards upon the South Coast of England. I must point out to him that although it is necessary, and always will be from the exigencies of the Naval Service, that the bulk of the money in reference to the Victualling Yards should be spent in England. Ireland is better off than Scotland, because Scotland does not possess a Victualling Yard at all. In distributing the Vote regard must be had to the capacity of the works, and in each case we have to ask for the precise sum which is necessary to keep up the establishment. It is hoped that when this Yard is completed at Haulbowline there will be further establishments attached to it. I do not see how it is expected to hasten the completion of the works by rejecting the salary of the officer in charge of them.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): May I be allowed to illustrate by another fact the niggardly system which the Admiralty applies to Ireland? Under this Vote will be found a number of charges in connection with all the English Victualling Yards, on account of the wages of the Police Force. At Deptford there is a sum of £2,842 a-year taken on account of the Police; at Gosport £1,600; and at Plymouth £1,300 or £1,400. That is to say that the wages of the police employed in the English Victualling Yards is defrayed out of the Navy Estimates. But although the wages of the police employed in the Haulbowline Yard used to be defrayed out of the Navy Estimates, it appears to have suddenly occurred to the Admiralty some 18 months or two years ago that it would be a very good thing to economize in this Vote at the expense of Ireland; and they now insist on throwing upon Ireland the Vote annually submitted for the Constabulary that previously used to be borne by the Navy Estimates. Whenever the Government can prevent any expenditure upon naval resources in Ireland they invariably do it; and they actually insist on the expense in connection with the police at Haulbowline being no longer defrayed out of this Vote, but out of the Irish Constabulary Vote. Then we are told in Committee of Supply, when we complain of the excessive character of the Constabulary Vote, that it is kept so large because of the condition of Ireland, although there is a considerable portion of the Vote for the Constabulary which ought to be paid out of the Navy Estimates, but which is no longer met by it. The police, in that respect in Ireland, are not treated in the same way as the police in this country. I submit that that is an illustration of the stingy manner in which the whole of the Admiralty work has for years been systematically treated in Ireland, and on that ground I shall vote with my hon. Friend.

MR. DEASY (Mayo, W.): I wish to ask one question in reference to the works at Haulbowline. In an answer given to a Question which was put to the Admiralty we were informed that the works at Haulbowline would be completed in 1888 or 1889. No doubt that is perfectly correct; but there will not be a single workshop erected by 1888. As far as I can make out not 1*s*. has been provided by the Government for the erection of works in connection with the Dock, or for putting up the machinery necessary for the working of the Dock when it is established. All the expenditure, so far incurred, has been applied to the harbour.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out several times that the works at Haulbowline come under another Vote. The only question raised here in reference to the works is the salary of the Superintending Civil Engineer.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I do not quite understand the explanation which was given to the Committee by the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty a short time ago. I am not quite sure whether he said that the items we are now asked to vote ought to be included in Vote 11, or whether he explained that there has been something included in Vote 11 which ought to appear in Vote 7.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I said that any charge in connection with Haulbowline Dockyard ought to have appeared in Vote 11. That, however, is merely a matter of account, and in this case I pointed out that there had been a mistake on the part of the Accounting Officer.

MR. BRADLAUGH: That is to say that the items under Sub-head E. ought really to have gone into the other Vote?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes.

MR. DEASY (Mayo, W.): As the salary of the Engineer in charge of these works is now under consideration, I would ask the noble Lord to give me an answer to this question—whether the Government intend to take steps to have the works complete in 1888? Unless this is done the money—£500,000 I believe—which ought to be expended in 1888 upon the Dockyard and Harbour of Haulbowline will be practically hung up for another year.

Mr. R. W. DUFF (Banffshire): The works at Haulbowline will require to be finished before engines and machinery and other things are provided. What I understand to be the position of the matter is this—the Engineer, who is paid £500 a-year under this Vote, has really nothing to do with superintending the Haulbowline works. While I was in Office I saw the Director of the Works several times, and I may confirm what has fallen from my hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) that the works will be finished next year. It is impossible to carry out all the works that are intended to be undertaken at Haulbowline until the Docks are completed. As soon as they are completed the other works will be taken in hand.

Mr. DEASY (Mayo, W.): On the first opportunity I shall draw the attention of the Government to what I consider the serious delay which has taken place in connection with the execution of the works at Haulbowline.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I must say that the answer I have received from the Government in reference to my Motion is not only incomplete, but most unsatisfactory. The noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) pointed out that the pay of the Engineer had got into this Victualling Yard Estimate by a mistake. Nevertheless it has got into the Estimate, and of course I can easily understand that the noble Lord is somewhat annoyed at our having been able to pick a hole in the Admiralty harness. No doubt Haulbowline is a standing proof of the incapacity, or the want of appreciation of the requirements of Ireland by the Board of Admiralty. I must say that the noble Lord has given no answer whatever to my complaint. I called attention to the fact that the Superintending Engineer has been engaged in the work for a considerable number of years, and that no steps have been taken to hasten their completion. I brought a charge of insufficiency and incapacity against him in dealing with this subject. I showed the noble Lord how this Dock has sprung a leak, and I certainly have received no reply from the Treasury Bench which is at all satisfactory. I was told that there was no leak in the Dock at all; but on referring to the people of Queenstown I received an intimation that the Dock is actually leaking at the present moment. Now I do not like subterfuge; but what I ask for is plain speaking and open and honest dealing. I do not understand being dealt with in this way either by the noble Lord, or any other occupant of the Treasury Bench.

Admiral FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I rise to Order. I wish to know if it is Parliamentary language to charge the noble Lord, or any other Member of the Treasury Bench, with having resorted to subterfuge?

Dr. TANNER: I never said so.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand the hon. Member to apply that term to the noble Lord, or I should have called him to Order.

Dr. TANNER: I did not accuse the noble Lord; but what I said was that those in charge of the work had been guilty of subterfuge, and I think I have plainly established that charge against them. When I hear from the Secretary to the Admiralty, or any other right hon. Gentleman opposite, that there is no such thing as a leak existing at the present moment in the Dock at Queenstown, and when I get an intimation from competent authorities on the spot telling me there is a leak, how am I to reconcile the discrepancy which exists between those two statements? I must believe either one side or the other. I cannot believe both, and to my mind there is something in the nature of a subterfuge on the part of the authorities in Queenstown who have supplied the noble Lord and the Parliamentary Secretary with the means of answering the Question which was put to them only the week before last. Then, again, in connection with another question which has already been before the House, how are these works to be gone on with if this leak continues; and if the leak continues is the engineer to be allowed to pursue the same course he has been following for so many years? Then, again, the noble Lord did not answer my question about the men employed at the works. I asserted that they were being discharged week after week and being sent about their business. At the present moment labour is cheap and easily obtainable; and if these works are to be finished in the course of two years, surely it is desirable to employ extra labour, and for the Admiralty to set about the work in earnest.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): My contention is that so long as the Superintending Civil Engineer is receiving a salary of £500 a-year, together with a special allowance of £100 a-year until the works are completed, the work itself will never be satisfactorily pushed on. The hon. Member for Banffshire (Mr. R. W. Duff), who spoke from above the Gangway on this side of the House, referred to the time at which it is calculated the works ought to be completed. I think it will be within his recollection that during his tenure of Office a sum of £1,500 was set aside for the erection of an engine room. In reply to a Question of mine the other day the hon. Gentleman the Civil Lord (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) stated that the machinery was ready, and that a space had been set aside for the erection of the engine room. I was quite aware of that; but if I remember rightly the hon. Gentleman said that the works had been ordered. Now, if the machinery is ready and a space has been set aside, and the Superintendent is on the spot, why not go on with the works? Why should they be delayed for another year or another two years, so that the Superintendent should have another additional £500 or £1,000, with an additional £100 or £200 for special allowance? What is he engaged in superintending at present? The convicts are all dispersed; the dock is dug to its proper depth; and yet this delay unfortunately continues. I think we ought to insist that the works for fitting up the Victualling Yard should go on *pari passu* with the works for the completion of the Dock, so that the salary of this Superintending Civil Engineer, together with the special allowance, may be withdrawn from the Estimates of next year, or, at any rate, the year after. That is the ground of our contention now, and a very good ground it is, and one which the noble Lord and the Admiralty ought to entertain. In regard to the leak I am able to speak from my own personal experience, because I saw it myself the other day, and yet right hon. Gentlemen are prepared to stand up in their places on the Front Bench and say that no leak exists. I saw tons of water flowing through it, and I do not wonder that my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) should use the language he did to characterize the information we received from the Front Bench in regard to matters of which we ourselves have special knowledge. I trust that the opportunity which has been given to-day for making these speeches and representations to the Committee will not arise in future. It is our earnest hope that an opportunity will not be given. You, Mr. Courtney, know from past experience that scarcely a year has passed without complaints of this kind having been brought under the notice of the Committee of Supply. If you will turn over the pages of *Hansard* you will see that year after year these matters have been brought forward and earnestly pressed by the Irish Members. I trust that this is the last appeal that we shall have to make to this Parliament for the purpose of insuring that these works shall be pressed forward. I hope that they will be rapidly completed, and the opportunity removed by the withdrawal from the Estimates of the salary of this officer, and his special allowance. I would suggest to the noble Lord that he should send down Sir Andrew Clarke to inspect the works. When there was a leak in the water works at Liverpool Sir Andrew Clarke went down and provided a remedy at once. I, therefore, trust that he may be sent down to Haulbowline.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I must point out to the hon. Member that the late Inspector General of Fortifications has resigned his post. The simple question now before the Committee is whether or not we should pay the Superintending Civil Engineer his salary for supervising the works? I must say that I do not think the additional allowance of £100 a-year is any inducement to the Superintending Civil Engineer to procrastinate the execution of the work.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.): I quite agree with the complaints which have been made by hon. Friends, and I think that the noble Lord should give some definite assurance that the works at Haulbowline will be carried out. In the absence of such an assurance it will be the duty of the Irish Members to protract the discussion of the matter.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): In connection with the answer I received from the Treasury Bench the other day, although it may not exactly be pertinent to the matter under discussion, I dare say I may be allowed to mention it. I was told that the Dock at Haulbowline would be capable of receiving either first or second-class ships in the Royal Navy. I see that there are several celebrated naval authorities in the House; and I want to know whether a Dock which can only accommodate a ship of 391 feet of keel will really be adequate for the accommodation of any of our large ships—such as the *Minotaur* or *Agincourt ?*

The CHAIRMAN: That is a question which is clearly out of Order upon this Vote.

Dr. TANNER: I knew it was; I said so.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 53; Noes 140: Majority 87.—(Div. List, No. 16.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. DEASY (Mayo, W.): Before you put the Question, Mr. Courtney, I wish to ask the noble Lord for a further statement on two points raised by my hon. Friend the Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor). It is a matter of notoriety that this leakage really exists in the Dock at Haulbowline, and I think there is very little reliance to be placed on the Report made by the Engineers and others interested in this matter. As far as we are concerned, we are not prepared to take their word on a matter of this sort. It is very easy for the noble Lord to get up and refer to the Engineers; but we know that these men are in the habit of representing facts to suit their own purposes. Therefore, I think that at least we should have an inspection of these works, which would cost the Government very little, and would place the matter beyond doubt. I myself went over the works with the Engineer, and was really astonished at the condition of things which I found to exist. I may not, however, be in Order in discussing the particulars in detail; and, therefore, I shall be content with the statement I have already made to the Committee. I would also like to know from him what are the intentions of the authorities with regard to the erection of the engine house? It appears to me that the machinery to be placed in this house has been completed, and that it is lying idle, and that the works have been ordered, but that the Engineer has not taken any steps to carry out the work. As this gentleman will have to be paid for a couple of years after the completion of the work, it is clearly his interest to continue this delay, so that he may be retained in the service of the Government for a further period. This is a state of things which I am sure the hon. Gentleman will see the impropriety of; and I hope he will say that the Engineer, who has little to do and who would be but slightly inconvenienced by looking after this work, will be ordered to carry out at once the intentions of the Government in respect of this small building, and get the machinery into position, so that some use may be made of it. I have to express my satisfaction at the answer of the noble and gallant Lord the Member for Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford) in respect of tenders, and I trust that the policy indicated will be carried out to a greater extent than hitherto.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Civil Lord of the Admiralty) (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I can assure the hon. Member that there is every desire on the part of the Government to see that these works are proceeded with as rapidly as they can be consistently with the interests of the Public Service. There seems to be a misunderstanding as to the answer I gave the other day on the question of the leakage in Haulbowline Dock. My reply was not that there was no leakage at the present moment, but that last year a certain amount of water made its way into the basin, below the finished portion of the Dock, and that this had since been remedied. If there is now a fresh inrush of water, it will be carefully examined and remedied.

Mr. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): We are still without any definite intimation of the intentions of the Admiralty with regard to the completion of the

Docks which there is supposed to be a person superintending, and also with regard to the erection of the engine-house. In answer to a Question put the other day, of which I gave full Notice, it was stated that the machinery was ready. I asked when the commencement of the work would be ordered; but have we anything definite from the Government on the points we have laid down and which we have pressed on the noble Lord? Has anything been said in the course of the discussion that will lead us to believe that these Docks will be completed, that the machinery will be erected, or that the works and repairs will be carried out? We have heard nothing of the kind from the noble Lord. The Lords of the Admiralty, two years ago, to my knowledge, fully inspected the Docks, and pronounced them fit for the building of small vessels. The same answer will continue to be given, and perhaps, when the Docks are finished, the Admiralty will issue a contract for a water-tank ship, and there will be a great deal of trumpet-blowing over it. Is Ireland anything better for these visits? Was 1*d*. more spent in Ireland from the Imperial Exchequer because of the noble Lord's visit to the North of Ireland? Not 1*d*. more; and yet we contribute to the Imperial Exchequer; we contribute to the cost of erecting these Docks; we pay a portion of the Engineer's salary, and we are entitled to insist that his salary should cease when the work is completed. I ask the noble Lord to stand up and give us a straightforward answer to a straightforward question. All the Representatives of the Admiralty have stood up one after another in their places, and, with the exception of the answer given by the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford) to another question, we have had no distinct answer on the points raised. It is made a standing charge against us that we are prolonging this discussion. It is no pleasure to us to do so; on the contrary, it is very disagreeable to us. Almost every hon. Member who has joined in this discussion have said that they have no desire whatever to exhaust the Forms of the House. We have no desire whatever to obstruct the Business of the House; but we shall certainly insist on our right to have a fair discussion of the points which interest us, and we certainly insist on our right that Her Majesty's Government shall tell us what they mean to do in these matters. Do they mean only to sit still and not answer with regard to the Establishments over which they preside? Do they mean that we should stand up year after year and occupy the time of the Committee on this question? We desire that there should be an earnest endeavour on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and on the part of the First Lord of the Admiralty, to complete these works at Haulbowline. We want you to begin, once for all, not only to construct your vessels there, but to have your vessels there, whether in time of war or peace, to equip your vessels there, and to make the place a port of call for repairs.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I do not know that I can go one step further than I have in replying to the hon. Member for South Tipperary. I have pointed out that this is not the Vote on which a discussion upon the money for the Dockyard can take place. I explained that the Engineer's and Superintendent's salary had been put under this Vote by mistake, and that it was anticipated that the work would be completed in two years, and that the desire of the Admiralty was that the work should begin as soon as possible. I do not think I can add anything to that statement. I repeat that it is our desire to utilize the Docks as fast as we can. I trust that hon. Gentlemen will now allow us to take the Vote.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.): There is one matter I would mention to the noble Lord, and that is that there should be some assurance with regard to the arrangements for the carrying out of the work being properly continued.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: In reply to the hon. Gentleman, I can say that if, when we go over the Docks, we have reason to believe that the existing arrangements for the completion of the works are not found to be effective, other arrangements will be substituted.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I see an item for water supplied to the Victualling Yard. I understand that to be for water supplied from Queenstown and carried over to Haulbowline. I find that the water supply of these establishments is paid for under another

Vote—namely, that in which the money for the Docks is taken. I should like an explanation of what seems to me an extraordinary fact—namely, that this Vote is not in its proper place.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: If the hon. Gentleman looks at the Estimates, he will see that the water supply, in other cases, is treated in the same way.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £66,000, to complete the sum for Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): In the debate on the Army Medical Service which took place the night before last, I said that I should reiterate on this occasion the statement I had made with reference to that branch of the Service. I stated that the Army Medical Service did not occupy the position which it ought to occupy, and I now say that the Naval Medical Service is in the same position. I do not intend to convey any disrespect for the eminent officers who concentrate in their persons a knowledge of the science which they profess, and who would shed a lustre on any Service; but, although there are many shining lights in both the Army and Navy Medical Departments, yet, as a rule, the rank and file supplied to these Departments of the Public Service have not been, in my opinion, of the order they should be—not so highly qualified, and what was the case in the past is practically the case at the present. We find that in the past the Naval Medical Service was for a long time distinctly "Boycotted" in the Medical Schools.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): I rise to Order. I ask whether the hon. Gentleman is in Order in discussing, on the Vote relating to the Naval Medical Service, points which ought to have been taken on Vote 1?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not aware that this subject comes exclusively under Vote 1.

DR. TANNER: I was saying that in the past, and indeed, to a great extent, at the present time, the Medical Service has been and is "Boycotted" at the various Medical Schools. In the Irish Schools, and many others with which I am acquainted intimately, I am able to say that this has been the practice; and I say that, if you will go down the list of the gentlemen in this Department, you will find that a great number of these officers come from Ireland. Accordingly I say that the greater number of those men who come from our Medical Schools and enter the Naval and Military Medical Service are not the best qualified men—that they are not men who distinguished themselves in their College course.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have given attention to the question raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price), and I am of opinion that he was right on the point of Order. The Vote 8 refers exclusively to certain medical establishments, to which the remarks of the hon. Member do not apply.

DR. TANNER: I have not the slightest wish to transgress your ruling; but I point out that this Vote applies to hospitals, and I presume they are attended by medical practitioners in the Naval Medical Service. I maintain that the medical men I have referred to are not of the standing they should be. While the country maintains these men at a great expense, who have not the qualifications they ought to have, I think the subject ought to be brought under the notice of this House. Of course, Sir, if you desire it, I shall say nothing more about the education of these medical men. At the same time, I think it is a matter deserving the close attention on the part of the House and the Committee that medical men belonging to the Service should be of the best class obtainable, and that the Navy should be better served in this respect than it is at present.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will not be in Order in pursuing that line of argument.

DR. TANNER: Then, Sir, I will refer to the hospitals which come under the consideration of the Committee in connection with this Vote. I find we have amongst them Haulbowline Hospital. Now, Sir, this is an extremely small hospital, and I find that the Vote in connection with it is only £1,935; whereas there is voted for Plymouth £12,160, and Haslar £16,766. We find that Haulbowline is treated in precisely the same way as the Dockyard we were speaking about just now. Hon. Members, I think, should bear in mind that the Admiral commanding at Queenstown is in command of the entire Irish Station; Queenstown is one of the principal ports of call also; and we find, notwithstanding, that Haulbowline is not served in the way it should be. I presume I am in Order in quoting the Medical Reports of the gentlemen who inspect the hospitals. I find that the last Report was issued in June, and here I may mention that the Medical Reports are not furnished as rapidly as they should be. It is important that we should have more Medical Reports than are now practically at the service of the House. I find that, unfortunately, we do not get in connection with the Navy the same direct Reports that are given in the case of the Army Medical Department. For instance, I find, in connection with the Army Medical Department, there are Reports actually dealing with the sanitary condition of the hospitals which come under consideration; but with regard to the hospitals in the Navy Medical Department I regret to say that this is not the case. However, in the General Report there is a great increase in the number of deaths and the amount of sickness. The people who are sick are not well treated in those hospitals, and, generally speaking, we find that men are invalided there. We find, also, that there is an increase in some of the more serious forms of disease. In the last Report which I have been able to obtain I find that in comparison with a preceding year, and also with those of the last 10 years, an increase is shown in the amount of sickness and in the number of deaths. The Report says—

> "Of course, this cannot be held to imply any retrogression in the general sanitary condition of the force; it is due to exceptional causes."

I will now call the close attention of the Committee to another branch of the subject in connection with the hospital to which I was alluding. The number of officers and men in the Fleet, I believe, is 43,000, of whom 22,950, or about 53·55 per cent, are between the ages of 25 and 35. The total number of cases of disease entered on the sick list is 49,814, which gives an average of nearly 1⅐ per man—that is to say, one-seventh more than the entire number are on the sick list, which, comparing it with the average ratios of the last 10 years, shows a very serious state of affairs. The deductions to be drawn from these statistics are by no means satisfactory; and, as a medical man, I should certainly not be doing my duty in my place in this House if I did not call the attention of the occupants of the Treasury Bench to the state of things which exist in the Medical Department. Passing forward, I point out that there is an average loss of service, owing to disease and injury, of 18·88 days for each person treated in the hospital, being an increase of 1·44 days. Now, I maintain that this country pays for its soldiers, and that, too, very heavily, and that by the loss of the services of these men the country is suffering loss to a very large extent; and I think we may be sure that this is largely due to want of care and attention on the part of the Admiralty in dealing with this Department of the Service. I find, also, that there is an increase of 20 per cent due to diseases of the digestive system. What is the reason of this increase? We find that it is practically brought about by the treatment both in the hospital and in service. Many persons treated at Haulbowline, after they have passed through the acute stage of disease to the chronic stage, are sent to Cork. When they arrive there they enter other hospitals, and we are able to get some explanation of the treatment they received in the Royal Naval Hospitals. Well, Sir, we find that they are not properly fed in those hospitals; that in Haulbowline in particular the dietary is not what it should be; and not only that, but this remark applies to the dietary in the Navy. I sincerely hope that the Government, and particularly the noble Lord who presides over the Department, will give serious attention to this subject. There is also another point in connection with the expenditure on these hospitals to which I should like to call the attention of the Committee. There has been a distinct increase in the more serious forms of venereal disease since the non-enforcement of certain clauses of the Contagious Diseases Act. I will not go into this matter in detail; but express a hope that some steps may be taken by both branches of the Service more effectively to prevent the increase of this form of disease. There is in Cork one hospital under this Act for both purposes; but I think some more effective steps may be taken by the Naval Authorities for dealing with this matter, and I shall leave it to the noble Lord to find out the best way of doing it. I may also say that these Reports show the highest yearly ratio in connection with this special matter since the year 1866, the year in which it first became the subject of legislation. Although I intended, I do not now propose to deal with the general question. I have drawn attention to a branch of the Service which demands every care and consideration; it is one with which the whole of the Service is indissolubly bound up; it is one in connection with which the cutting down of expenditure would undoubtedly be penny wise and pound foolish. What has been said with regard to the Commissariat applies with even more extended force to the Medical Department of the Service. We generally find that when a Tory Government comes into power it spends a good deal of money. Nevertheless, I observe that the Naval Estimates of this year have been more or less cut down; and for the reason I have given I venture to urge upon the Government, and especially upon the noble Lord at the head of the Department, that they should deal with the matter of these hospitals in no grudging spirit.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD (A LORD of the ADMIRALTY) (Marylebone, E.): Sir, I believe you ruled the hon. Member out of Order as to his proposal to treat of the qualifications of medical officers in the Navy. I do not intend to discuss that question; but I am bound to say that, as far as the officers and men of the Navy are concerned, we are quite satisfied with the class of medical men who come into the Service. We find them all to be a very careful and genial set of men, and, as I have said, we are quite satisfied with their treatment as medical practitioners. I am sure the hon. Gentleman will agree with me that the proportion of money voted for Haslar Hospital, which is the headquarters for all classes in the Navy, must necessarily be in excess of that voted for the hospital at Queenstown. In our opinion the money voted for Queenstown is sufficient for the purposes for which it is intended, although when the demands on it increase there is no doubt that a larger sum will be devoted to it. I think the hon. Gentleman is quite right in his remarks upon the increase of the rate of sickness. The rate of sickness has increased, and he is justified in asking why it has done so. The considerable addition to the number of men on the sick lists of the various hospitals is the result of the law which recently came into force with respect to venereal disease. When that law came into force it increased very largely the number of men in the hospital. The next point is that we have had lately extensive operations in Egypt, and this has also had an effect in increasing the number on the sick list, the climate in the neighbourhood of Suakin being very bad for men under 40 years of age. Even if the men do not get affected while they are there, they are almost sure to suffer from the climate afterwards. I have one more remark to make in reply to the hon. Gentleman; and that is, as far as comparisons between the Army and Navy in the matter of sickness are concerned, there must always be an excess in the case of the Navy, and for a very natural reason. We in the Navy are practically always on active service; it makes no difference to us whether it is a time of peace or war. The mere drill of our men, the severe work they have to go through, and the climatic influences to which they are exposed, are in themselves sufficient to show an excess of sickness as compared with the sister Service.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): The noble and gallant Lord who has just sat down omitted to mention a most important point brought forward by the hon. Member for Cork County (Dr. Tanner). My hon. Friend, speaking as a medical man, said that, when persons were brought to be treated at Cork by civil practitioners, the latter came to the conclusion that the men in the naval hospitals were not dieted in a proper manner; and he went on to say that he had some reason to believe that this deficiency of dietary was not merely limited to hospitals, but was general throughout the Service. I think the Committee will agree that, if there is any foundation whatever for such an opinion as my hon. Friend has expressed with regard to the dietary in the Service, it is a very serious matter, and demands close attention on the part of Her Majesty's Government as well as the Admiralty Authorities. The noble and gallant Lord appears to have passed this point by as one not calling for special reference; but it appears to me to be one of more importance than any other which my hon. Friend brought forward. With reference to this Vote, I wish to point out that wherever the Admiralty can prevent the expenditure of naval resources in Ireland they do so. In the Medical Establishments in Great Britain you find a constant charge for the services of the police force employed in hospitals and elsewhere. Well, Sir, under the heads of all these hospitals in England you will find this charge for police; the Police Votes being relieved in this manner of a charge in connection with naval hospitals; but it is not so in Ireland, the Constabulary Vote having to bear the expenditure in connection with the police force in hospitals. I want to know why the Government adopt these different systems as between the two countries? Why should the Constabulary Vote bear that which in England is not brought against the Police Vote? It seems to me that the Admiralty cut down the expenditure in Ireland in order to increase their expenditure in this country. With regard to works in England, the Admiralty never hesitate to exceed the amount voted by Parliament; but you never find a Vote exceeded in the case of Ireland. I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee unduly with this matter; but I must say that it is a system of which it is impossible for an Irish Member to witness the application to every branch of the Naval Service, in every year, without some feelings of irritation. This subject has been brought under the attention of Her Majesty's Government year after year; the Representatives of the Admiralty come down to this House and constantly make the same statements; but nothing is ever done to remedy this inequality. I think, at any rate, if the Admiralty take such small Votes for Ireland, they should insist upon those Votes being expended, instead of half of them being returned to the Treasury, as is now the case.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) The noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford) said that officers and men were quite satisfied with the medical attendance they received in the Service. I wish to call the attention of the noble and gallant Lord to the fact that officers of the Royal Navy, when stationed at Queenstown, Plymouth, or Portsmouth, are not altogether satisfied, when they are ill, with the medical officers on the Station. On the contrary, as a rule, you find that when they are ill a civil practitioner is brought in; and that, in itself, ought to convince the noble and gallant Lord that the standing of the Medical Service is not actually what he has represented it to be. There is another point which I overlooked just now. We find that heart disease, both functional and organic, is a most frequent cause of the invaliding of men in the Navy; and my supposition is that the examination is insufficient. I am told that every fully trained soldier costs the country £120. If a man enters the Service suffering from incipient heart disease, organic or inorganic, and goes through certain stages of training, the physical exercise which that training entails must in due process of time tend to increase a disease, the germs of which he had when he entered the Naval Service. The man is brought down on his weak point; and accordingly we find that, owing to heart disease, by far the greater number of men are invalided from the Navy. I maintain that this constitutes a serious indictment against the Naval Medical Service. The noble and gallant Lord is, no doubt, quite right in saying that he is satisfied with the medical officers in the Navy; but that is not, as I have shown, the case with others.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have told the hon. Gentleman more than once that he is out of Order in discussing the question of medical officers on this Vote.

DR. TANNER: In that case, Sir, I will not pursue the subject further.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): On the part of the Naval Profession, I trust, Sir, you will allow me to give my unqualified contradiction to the statement of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.): My hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has pointed out that the duties of the police in connection with the hospitals in Ireland are discharged by the Constabulary. Now, attention has been also called to the fact that there is a great want of employment for discharged soldiers and sailors whose time is expired, and for others who, having served a considerable portion of their time, were waiting for discharge. I suggest, therefore, to the noble and gallant Lord that in these hospitals and similar establishments employment might be found for soldiers and sailors who have been discharged. The duties at these establishments might very well be discharged by these men instead of by outsiders.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I addressed a question to the noble and gallant Lord, to which I trust I shall have an answer. I want the noble and gallant Lord to explain to the Committee how it is that such large numbers of men in the Navy are invalided on account of heart disease? If I cannot get an answer, I shall have no alternative but to move the reduction of the Vote by the amount of the salaries of the medical officers.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD (A Lord of the Admiralty) (Marylebone, E.): In answer to the question of the hon. Member, as to how it is that so many men in Her Majesty's Navy appear on the sick list, I cannot give any reason, unless it is that, as I have said, the work is always going on in the Navy, which may tend to produce heart disease. But I think the hon. Gentleman is in error when he says that the boys have it when they enter the Service. It costs £300 to make a man a seaman. The boys are carefully selected, not only with respect to their character, but also with respect to their health. With regard to the question of diet, I think the hon. Gentleman is also in error. I can only say that there is no complaint as to the food supplied in the Navy. I may mention, also, that the boys, by not taking up all they are allowed by the Crown, can materially add to their savings, and therefore add to their diet as they please. With regard to the question which the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Nolan) asked in reference to the employment of police at hospitals, I must say that this is not a matter within my knowledge.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3) £20,700, to complete the sum for Marine Divisions.

(4.) £1,205,000, to complete the sum for Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c.

Admiral FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I trust the Committee will excuse me if I intrude on their attention for a few minutes. I did not attempt to address the House on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, because I was desirous to promote the progress of Business. Allusion has been made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) to certain deficiencies in our shipbuilding policy, and notably in the case of the *Impérieuse.* I first drew attention to this matter by a Question which the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) answered. I do not wish to say more with regard to the answer of the noble Lord than that it has not been quite verified by the result. As far as my information goes, on the eve of the ship going to sea she was drawing more water than he told us at that time she was drawing.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): I rise to Order, Mr. Courtney. Would it not be better if the hon. and gallant Gentleman raised this question on the second part of the Vote?

Admiral FIELD: I am dealing with "Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet;" and, therefore, I imagine I am entitled to speak on either portion of the Vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the observations of the hon. and gallant Gentleman would be more pertinent to the second portion of the Vote, though I cannot say he would be out of Order in continuing them now.

Admiral FIELD: I am much obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for not ruling me out of Order, and I ask the noble Lord to bear patiently with me. I only desire to help him and his Department, and not to impede or embarrass him; that has not been my object in a single question I have addressed to him in the House. I have but one burning desire, and that is to stand up for what I believe to be right, and to promote in every way the efficiency of our Naval Service, upon which the safety of this Empire mainly depends. I ask for the patience and forbearance of my hon. Friends, and beg them not to look upon me as a hostile critic. What I may say does not affect the noble Lord or his Board; he is not responsible for the shortcomings of which I complain; his Predecessors are the persons who are responsible. ["No, no!"] Hon. Members say "No, no!" but it is not difficult to prove the statement. But I do not wish to make this a Party question. I was alluding to the case of the *Impérieuse*, to which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) referred. I will not say more in respect to this case than that a great scandal has been exposed, and I was glad to hear the noble Lord state that precautions will be taken to prevent a repetition of such grave scandals. A Constructor's Department of the Admiralty is, no doubt, absolutely necessary; but I think we depend too much upon that Department, and do not avail ourselves of the great ability which lies outside of it. We do not pay enough to command the best talent of the country. Naval architecture is a most difficult study, and yet we do not give to the designer of a first-class iron-clad what an architect gets for designing a church. The most intricate problems have to be solved in the designing of an iron-clad; therefore we ought to seek the best talent, and ought not to be afraid to pay for it. The *Impérieuse* is not the only ship of which complaint is to be made. The defects of the *Phæton* are notorious.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and gallant Gentleman is clearly out of Order in entering on the question of the construction and designs of ships, or the organization of ships, on this Vote. This Vote refers only to naval stores, and the discussion should be confined to stores. The 2nd section of the Vote is the one upon which the question in which the hon. and gallant Gentleman is interested could be more properly raised.

ADMIRAL FIELD: Then I will pass by that question, and wait until the 2nd section of the Vote is brought on. I find that £51,500 is included in this Vote for the purchase of torpedoes; and, therefore, I will ask the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) whether he can give us any information as to when the torpedo boats that have been ordered by contract are likely to be completed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Torpedoes also come under the 2nd section of the Vote.

ADMIRAL FIELD: Then we will pass on to the remedy I was about to suggest for the shortcomings which I allege exist in our Admiralty administration. I maintain there is a great want of responsibility for the Admiralty shortcomings, be they connected with shipbuilding, repairs, or stores. My brother officers agree with me that there is no adequate naval responsibility under the existing system. The whole system of naval responsibility has been changed within my recollection and the recollection of everybody in this House. A very important and radical change took place in 1869. The then First Lord of the Admiralty practically got himself converted into a Minister of Marine without the sanction of Parliament, and reduced the Naval Lords to mere Heads of Departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. and gallant Gentleman is now indulging in criticism of the *personnel* of the Admiralty, which is not proper under this Vote.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Mr. Courtney, the hon. and gallant Gentleman was speaking just now about torpedoes, and you called him to Order. I find that Sub-head F, under Naval Stores, relates to "electrical, torpedo, and other appliances," and that "for torpedo and other purposes" £54,300 is asked. I wonder how that is explained.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did explain to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and he appreciated the explanation.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I wish to make some observations with regard to the 1st section of this Vote. Perhaps it is rather to be regretted that the two sections could not be taken together, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Admiral Field) might have been able to realize his ardent wish. In regard to naval stores, I desire to ask the noble Lord if he can give the Committee any information as to the condition of the stores at the present time? Of late years there have been very great oscillations in the amount of stores in hand and available for active service from time to time. The depletion of stores at certain periods during the last two years has been very great indeed. The reduction has not been carried out with regard to one kind of stores only—has not been confined to the stores which are technically known as naval stores—but has extended to almost every kind of stores within the administration of Her Majesty's Board of Admiralty. The Comptroller and Auditor General has said that it is perfectly impossible for him to certify that the accounts are properly kept, or that the stocks on hand are what they are represented to be. In his last Report the Comptroller and Auditor General says—

> "From the Stock Valuation Returns it will be observed that the values of the respective stocks have in the course of the year 1884-5 diminished to the extent of £114,000 worth in the case of the victualling stores, and to the amount of £150,000 worth in the case of the clothing stores."

It is, however, not so much to the victualling and clothing stores, which do not properly come under the present Vote, that I wish to ask the attention of the Committee, but to those stores which are more technically known as naval stores. The reduction with regard to them is also very notable. The Comptroller and Auditor General says—

> "In the case of the diminution in value of naval stores under Vote 10 to the amount of £150,775, it is to be observed that it has occurred notwithstanding a net excess of expenditure over grant of £11,000, after taking into account the sum of £87,000 voted in the Supplementary Estimates"—

that is to say, that though the amount voted by Parliament for this particular service was not only expended, but a considerable amount of money over and above that was also disbursed, yet there was a concurrent depletion of the stores. The Comptroller and Auditor General, who is the officer appointed by this House for the express purpose of investigating the condition of the accounts of the Spending Departments in every branch of administration, admits himself utterly unable to give an account to the House of the condition of these naval stores. Sir, I think I have said enough to direct the attention of the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to the particular point in regard to which I desire to elicit, if possible, some information. I am not desirous of detaining the Committee longer than is absolutely necessary for my purpose, which is to impress upon the Committee that although the Votes are exceeded the stores are depleted. What is the condition of the naval stores at this moment? Are they in a state of depletion, or are the Government in a position to assure the Committee that in case of a sudden emergency—and we know one may arise in the East of Europe at any moment—our Naval Authorities are in a position to equip and send out a Fleet thoroughly complete in all respects; and are they also able to tell us that they have a reserve from which to fill up depleted stores?

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. FORWOOD) (Lancashire, Ormskirk): In the short time during which I have had an opportunity of looking into matters connected with the Admiralty the question of the depletion of stores has occupied my attention; and I am happy to be able to inform the hon. Member that although at the end of this year there will be a less amount of naval stores than there was at the commencement of the year, that depletion will, as I think I shall be able to show, be rather an advantage to the Service than otherwise. The depletion arises from the fact that a change has been made in the material used by our ships of war, our modern ships requiring very different material to that used by the ships of some years ago. The value of the stores in stock at the end of this financial year is estimated at £2,000,000. I think that affords a very large margin, and is amply sufficient to meet any emergency that may arise. In addition to that we have the country, which is, in fact, a great store-house, to draw upon in case of an emergency. I think the hon. Member will agree with me that it is undesirable to pile up stores which in time, of course, become obsolete or decayed. The diminution in the value of stores this year will amount to £250,000, and that arises not from a diminution of the stores that are at present useable, but largely from a diminution of the stores that are not in use in the Fleet—that are, in fact, useless. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that now, when any stores are ordered for a specific ship in course of construction, they are not carried into the store-house, but are taken direct to the ship. This reduces, apparently, the value of the stores in stock. The new system is a very great improvement in administration, for which we have to thank the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hibbert), who at the time it was introduced occupied the position I have now the honour to hold. I have no doubt it will be satisfactory to the Committee to learn that we are arranging for the appointment of a Committee to examine into the system of contracting for the Admiralty. That Committee will, no doubt, have to take into its cognizance the question of the value and extent of stores it is desirable to have in hand.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I am much obliged to the hon. Gentleman for the detailed and careful answer he has given to my question; but I should like to ask one or two supplementary questions arising out of his statement. He has told us that there will be at the end of this financial year naval stores to the value of £2,000,000; and he seems to think that is a sufficient quantity for the requirements of the country even in case of an emergency. But I must point out that the amount taken on the Estimates last year for this particular service was £1,500,000; so that, even assuming that all the stores you have in hand are brand new, you have very little more than a year's production. Is it not a fact, I will ask the hon. Gentleman, that a great many of the stores now in stock are in reality very far from being new; that a considerable amount of them are really unsaleable? With regard to the estimate of value—£2,000,000—which the hon. Member has given us, is it not a fact that if a good portion of these stores were sold, as from time to time they are, they would realize only about one-fourth, possibly even less than that, of the nominal value according to the official price list of the Admiralty? It is all very well to say that, according to our official list, we have stores valued at £2,000,000; but if you find that a large portion of them are no longer serviceable, that they are out of date, that they are deteriorated or obsolete, you have to get rid of them, and you get a very small sum for them. The official valuation of £2,000,000 would be very materially reduced. The question I ask is, whether, as a matter of fact, many of the stores represented by the valuation of £2,000,000 are not in reality stores which are, to a certain extent at any rate, obsolete, and which the Admiralty would not think of issuing to the Fleet?

MR. FORWOOD: The figure which I gave—£2,000,000—represents the cost of the stores, and not their present value. We have special articles required by the Navy, and very probably their value in the market would be very much less than we attach to them. As regards the question what amount of these £2,000,000 worth are obsolete stores, I am only able at present to give a general answer. I have made inquiries in the Dockyards upon the subject; and I am assured that in recent years there has been a considerable clearing out of obsolete stores, and that the proportion of useful stores now in stock is very much larger than at any former time.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I see that the proceeds of the sale of unserviceable stores is only £40,000 this year, whereas last year it was £45,000. That in itself shows there is a falling-off in the system of depletion of stores; that stores are not got rid of to the extent we were led to understand. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Forwood) said that modern vessels do not require the class of stores with which former ships of the Royal Navy were furnished. Am I to understand that modern vessels do not require the great mass of the same articles? Under Sub-head B provision is made for—

> "Metals and metal articles, including iron, copper, and steel, armour-plates, beams, rivets, masts, &c."

Surely, Sir, it is absurd to say that modern ships of war do not require the mass of these articles. Again, we find in one of the large items especially—"coals and patent fuel"—that there is a diminution in the charge; this year it is £231,000, while last year it was £261,000. In point of fact, there is a general falling-off in these Estimates. Under Sub-head A, "timber, masts, deals, &c.," the charge for "Fleet and Coast Guard" is £159,200, as against £233,500 last year. Again, under the heading "metal and metal articles," we have also a falling-off nearly in the same proportion. In "coals and patent fuel" there is also a considerable falling-off. Again, under the next heading, "hemp, canvas, &c." there is one point to which I should like to direct the attention of the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) and Her Majesty's Government. It has relation to a small item; but in connection with a very large Service like the Naval Service, taken in the aggregate, it means a very considerable expenditure in the year—the item is that for coal sacks. We find that under the heading "hemp, canvas, &c.," the total expenditure this year is £122,000. At the present time, owing to several causes, notably owing to the depreciation of silver and to the advantages which India possesses in connection with the rate of exchange, you find that the jute trade in these countries has suffered a considerable amount of depression; and we are also aware that the people of the town of Dundee in Scotland principally live by the manufacture of jute. Now, what I have to ask is whether in this time of great distress in that part of Scotland the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) will, as far as possible, try to keep the manufacture of coal sacks in the hands of home manufacturers; whether he will strive to keep the work at home, and to give the industrious Scotch people a chance of living in this period of depression? I sincerely hope he may do so. Again, we find that there is a falling-off under Sub-head E—

> "Paint materials, oils, pitch, tar, tallow, furniture, and other miscellaneous articles."

I am perfectly certain that modern ships require paint quite as much as any old ships did. Modern ships may be made of iron or steel; but if they are not protected by paint they will rust and decay, just as the old wooden walls of ancient and bygone days. I find that, as a rule, under all these headings, be they metals, coals, hemp, or paint, there is a general falling-off; and I should like to hear from the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton), or from some other Member of Her Majesty's Government, what is the reason for this great falling-off which we notice in the Estimates?

Mr. FORWOOD: In reply to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman (Dr. Tanner) I have to say that the falling-off in the demands in the case of most of the articles covered by this Vote arises from the fact that very large purchases were made out of the Vote of Credit 18 months' ago. Our stores were made up out of the Vote of Credit, and there was no occasion to duplicate them at the present time. We have now metal, paint, and other articles, in sufficient quantity to meet the requirements of our modern ships.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): There is one other point in connection with this Vote I desire to raise. If I am in Order in referring to the appropriation in aid "for proceeds of sale of ships," I would like to say that for some years past, when ships have been condemned as no longer serviceable, the system has been to obtain an offer from a private firm. When the matter came before the Public Accounts Committee two years ago, they reported rather emphatically in favour of a system of advertising and of *bonâ fide* competition; but, in spite of the representations of the Public Accounts Committee, the Admiralty continued the old system, and a considerable number of ships were sold in that very year to a private firm without the least chance of competition from outsiders. The Admiralty justified their proceedings by saying that—

> "Past experience has led them to believe that better prices are obtained by private negotiations with this particular firm than can be obtained from anyone else, and that to advertise ships intended to be sold will, therefore, be useless."

The Public Accounts Committee did not accept the view of the Admiralty, and they recommended that a *bonâ fide* competition should be secured. After all, it is a rather serious matter, because many of these naval stores and old ships are worth a good deal of money; and if you have a system by which these stores of which you really do not obtain any proper account from year to year are to be condemned by a Board practically irresponsible in the matter, and sold to some private person who may be utterly unknown either to this House or the public, there is very great danger of many of these stores being sold at a figure much below their real value. I believe there are many contractors in the City of London and other places who would be only too glad to know, when these naval stores are to be sold, when these old ships are to be obtained, because they have markets for them in certain parts of the world, and they would be glad to have an opportunity of buying them. The principle which is violated is an important one—namely, that there shall be no disposal of the public stores without public advertisement, and free competition amongst all those who desire to compete for their purchase. The intention is that there shall be no power on the part of the Admiralty Authorities of getting rid of their stores at a small nominal price, benefiting a few men who happen to be on a favoured list, or, as it happens in this case, benefiting one particular firm.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The practice with regard to the sale of ships is to have a contract with one firm. They are the only firm who do any business in the way of purchasing old vessels. Part of the system is that there shall be a scheduled price for ships so old, and that at any time the Admiralty have the right, if they wish to do so, to advertise a ship to be sold, and to accept a tender if it is in excess of the scheduled price. [Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: But they do not do it.] Yes; only a few days ago. I quite agree with the hon. Gentleman that it is desirable to extend, as far as possible, competition for the purchase of old ships; but the present system is found to work advantageously to the Public Service.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): Will the noble Lord undertake that in future there should be advertisements in every case?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: I could have that done if it is necessary. There is a good reason against it, and that is that probably we should lose by it. I will look into the matter, and if there seems to be any likelihood of this one firm getting too good a bargain I will take care public advertisements are issued.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I understood the noble Lord to say we should probably lose by it—in what way?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I remember that on several occasions attempts were made to obtain better prices through the means of advertisements than were obtained under the contract with Messrs. Castle, and in every case the offers received from outside contractors were very much lower than the prices of Messrs. Castle.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Will the noble Lord consent to lay on the Table a copy of the agreement with Messrs. Castle?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I do not think that would be advisable. I have stated to the Committee the exact nature of the agreement. Messrs. Castle do not care to tender publicly. They act on scheduled prices, and in every case we have tested we have found their prices higher than those offered by others. I think we ought to be satisfied that it is the best possible arrangement that can be made.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): In what way are the articles mentioned under Sub-head D., notably sacks, obtained? Are they obtained by tender?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes; by tender.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £2,370,300, to complete the sum for Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne): I rise to continue the remarks I was not permitted to make upon the last Vote. Upwards of £2,000,000 is covered by this Vote; and I hold that so large a sum should not be voted, whatever the purpose to which it is intended to be devoted, without adequate discussion. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) told us some days ago that he did not in any way wish to stifle discussion on the Estimates; I am glad of that, and I trust the Committee will bear with me while I endeavour to draw its attention to a matter which deeply concerns the welfare of the country. I pass by the case of the *Impérieuse* to direct attention to the breakdown of the machinery of the *Phæton.* I put a Question to the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) on the subject not long ago; but it is impossible, in an answer to a Question, to state all the facts, as it is equally impossible to enumerate them in a Question. The machinery of the *Phæton* has broken down, and many beside me contend that it has broken down because the engines are badly designed. We maintain, also, that it is impossible so to repair the engines that they can do their duty for the next 10 years as they ought to do. If the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward Reed) were present I am sure he would endorse my statement. For instance, the cylinders have no double bearing to save the wearing out of the lower half of the cylinders. Naval men who understand anything about machinery believe that to be a defect in principle which cannot be remedied, and that, therefore, the engines ought not to have been accepted. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) admitted in his answer to the Question I put to him the other day that due caution was not observed by those responsible for accepting the engines from the contractors. That is a very grave admission for the noble Lord to make. This ship cost a large sum of money, and we believe the engines cannot be repaired without a considerable further expenditure. We believe that when repaired she will be continually liable to break down. Everything tended to a break-down. An engineer was retired just before her commission; all the men of the engine room were drafted to other ships; and when the ship was commissioned there was only one chief engineer on her who really knew anything about her, and he had only been six months in the ship. You know the result. She broke down. A Court of Inquiry was held, and the engineer was superseded. An entirely new man to the ship was appointed chief engineer, and a break-down worse than the previous one followed. The Admiralty appear to have acted upon the principle that somebody must be punished. I want to know who is responsible for these failures? There is at present no real naval responsibility for anything that happens. The noble Lord knows to what I refer, and I beg him seriously to consider the point. I do not ask the noble Lord to give me an answer to-day. I do not press for it, and I would rather not have it. What I and my brother officers want, and what we are determined to use all our exertions to obtain, is the restoration of the Naval Lords of the Admiralty to their proper position as Colleagues of the First Lord. I ask the noble Lord to consider carefully our views on this matter, and, if he can, remove this grievance, sentimental though it may be considered by some people.

Captain PRICE (Devonport): In this Vote there is an item for the building of ships by contract. There are three very large ships at present under construction by contract—namely, the *Benbow*, the *Sanspariel*, and the *Renown*, all vessels of over 10,000 tons—vessels which, when complete, will cost this country £1,000,000 a-piece, or something not very far short of that amount. As I said yesterday, these vessels really are nothing more or less than floating gun carriages. They appear to be constructed with a view of carrying into action certain guns; that is the sole duty, so to speak, they will be called upon to perform. Now, Sir, after the discussions we have had in the Press and in this House upon our guns, it is very necessary the Lords of the Admiralty should seriously consider whether we are really justified in going on with the building of these enormous and costly gun carriages. We really do not know whether we shall ever have reliable guns to put on board of them. I have always said in this House that I was in favour of building vessels of a more moderate size. I do not want to suggest that the vessels which are now under construction should not be proceeded with; but from time to time, as these Estimates come before us, we are expected to vote sums for the commencement of vessels of the same type and size. I hope the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) will tell us that before he asks this Committee to vote money for the commencement of vessels of the same size and type he will have satisfied himself that by the time they are completed he will have such guns to put on board them as this country may rely upon. At the present moment we are in a very peculiar position. We have some of these very large vessels, but we have no guns on board them upon which we can rely; and I do ask whether it would not be better, in view of this state of things, that we should commence at once to build by contract, or in our own Dockyards, some vessels of a much more moderate size which can be used as rams and for carrying torpedoes? I must say I believe that the naval battles of the future will be fought rather with rams and torpedoes than with guns. I do not know whether it is a very orthodox thing for a gunnery officer to say; but I have long been of that opinion. I do not believe so much in these enormous guns. In the first place, we have not got them, and if we had them I do not think they will do the duty which is expected of them. I should like to know whether some of the smaller armoured belted vessels which are being built by contract—vessels of the *Orlando* class—will be capable of ramming. They are belted cruisers; but whether they are strong enough to ram I do not know. Every vessel that pretends to be armour-plated should be thoroughly capable of inflicting a blow upon vessels of any size, and I think that this quality might very easily be secured. At all events, of this I am quite sure—that in any future naval action the captain of a ship who does not ram a vessel when she shows her broadside ought to be hanged. I do not wish to detain the Committee; but whilst I am on my legs I should like to ask a question upon another item included in this section of the Vote. Under Sub-head K the sum of £51,500 is asked—

> "For torpedoes purchased under special circumstances by the Admiralty, instead of obtaining them through the War Department."

Now, can the noble Lord assure us that the money he is asking for for the purpose of torpedoes is really sufficient, and that upon the expenditure of this money we really shall have a sufficient number of torpedoes with which to arm our vessels and to keep up the stock for future occasions? I do hope that the noble Lord will be able to give us a definite answer on this point, because I am informed by those who ought to know that we have not a sufficient stock of torpedoes, or anything like a sufficient stock. And I should like to know very much whether that is not the opinion of the Naval Authorities of the Admiralty. I should also like to ask, though I know I should not be answered, whether the late First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) was not asked for more money for torpedoes, but refused to grant it? At all events, I trust the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty will tell us whether the stock of torpedoes we have is amply sufficient for all our purposes.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton): It is not my wish to take up the time of the Committee; but there is one point to which I desire to call attention. There is a very strong feeling amongst contractors generally that they are not all equally or fairly treated. I do not for one moment suppose that there is anything but perfectly fair play dealt out to the contractors; but I know that everyone is not of the same opinion. I think it would be very much better that when contracts, not only for ships but for machinery, are entered into it should be understood that the lowest tender was accepted; if the lowest tender was not accepted some good cause should be given for departing from the general practice. When the names of the successful firms are published the actual sum for which the engines or ships have been contracted for should be given; and I think, also, that when the ships or engines are received into the Dockyards and finally accepted the exact sum expended in extras should be given. I am sure that if this were done there would be a greater feeling of satisfaction amongst the contractors, and we should get more eminent persons to tender for our work. It has always been my belief, and I imagine that of the Committee, that the more we educate the general shipbuilding and engineering establishments of the country to our requirements the more fit they will be in time of war to undertake the tremendous responsibility which will rest upon them. I am not for taking away a single man or a single iota of work from our Naval Dockyards —God knows the time may not be far distant when we may require every man we have got—but, at the same time, I think we should now in time of peace educate as much as possible our great contractors. The reason why the contractors' prices are so high is that the contractors do not know what their responsibilities may be. The Inspector sent down to one private firm may be a very different kind of man to the man sent down to another yard, and his employment may mean a loss or gain of, perhaps, £30,000 to the contractors. I myself have seen Inspectors take very different estimates of work done. One Inspector will consider it his duty to cavil at every little thing that is done. What is the consequence? Reference has to be made to the Admiralty, and half-a-dozen, or it may be half-a-hundred, men lie idle for a long time waiting for the order for them to proceed with their work. I do not believe it is the intention of the Lords of the Admiralty that such should be the case. I believe what they want is to have good work done for them, and to pay a good, honest, fair mercantile price for it. But as long as you keep the contracts for naval work in one ring so sure you may be that the contracts will not be satisfactorily executed.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I should like to know whether the Admiralty intend to try the Nordenfelt submarine torpedo boat? I certainly think the Admiralty ought to get one one or two of these boats. I do not know Mr. Nordenfelt personally; but I know he has been very successful in mechanics. The boat he has produced appears to be completely safe, while it is capable of doing good work. The enormous advantage of submarine boats is admitted. Mr. Nordenfelt does not propose that his boat should always be under water. It can steam 600 or 700 yards under water, or duck into the water for a short distance. The principle seems so thoroughly reasonable that I trust the Admiralty will acquire one or two of the boats. It is high time the Admiralty announced some policy in respect to submarine torpedo boats; they ought either to say they will order some or they will not. I can fancy that a number of these submarine boats which are capable of ducking under water for a short time frightening a whole fleet.

CAPTAIN **PRICE** (Devonport): I should like to ask if it is not true that Mr. Nordenfelt's submarine boat is at the present moment at the bottom of the sea?

COMMANDER **BETHELL** (York, E.R., Holderness): I do not propose to address myself to the general question of shipbuilding — that question has been very deliberately discussed this year—but I desire to direct the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to one or two matters of more technical interest. Now, as to the coaling of our vessels. The great importance of the coal supply of our ships has been constantly pointed out in this House; but it is not generally known, perhaps, that the coaling of our ships takes an extremely long time. The methods now in operation have been in vogue for a great many years; they ought long ago to have been improved. Part of the difficulty that is experienced in coaling is due to the smallness of the aperture through which the coal is passed. I am not at liberty to refer to the other part of the coaling operation, because that would be more properly alluded to on the Dockyards Vote; but I think the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) may well give his attention to the matter. I pass to the question of electric lighting for our ships. I do not consider that the existing system of lighting is a very dangerous one. Undoubtedly there is a certain amount of danger surrounding it; but it is not worth taking into consideration. I believe, however, I am correct in saying that electric lighting can be more economically carried out in ships than anywhere else, and that it is more advantageous than any other system of lighting we have had. If that is true, everyone will, of course, recognize the great convenience which such a system will be in our ships. It is certainly no less than the fact that in the winter months the quarters of the men are in constant darkness. There is just enough light to make darkness visible, and the men have to get candles and things they ought not to have to light up their mess table. I think the electric light might be advantageously introduced. Nothing is of greater importance, and nothing has given us greater trouble, than the subject of bow lights. In small ships it is extremely difficult to keep them alight in bad weather; but, seeing what has been done on board merchant vessels since the introduction of the electric light, that difficulty has completely vanished. I would ask the attention of those responsible for these matters to this question of electric lighting. As to the repairing of vessels, when they come into the Dockyards, after, perhaps, having been in bad weather, there is a great deal they require to have done to them; but I believe I am correct in saying that before any repairs can be undertaken by the Dockyard, no matter how important or necessary they may be, it is necessary that an estimate should be first prepared, submitted to the Admiralty, and sent back by them to the Dockyard. Now, that seems to me to involve a great waste of time. It does not seem necessary to me that this form should be gone through. If the repairs are necessary they should be at once undertaken at the Dockyards, and the necessary documents should be forwarded to the Admiralty afterwards. I am told by those who have to do with these matters that great waste of time arises from this cause alone. Then I should like to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will take steps to prevent Captains appointed to vessels being allowed to have great alterations made in their vessels when they are appointed? The Committee should understand that all Her Majesty's ships, before being placed in commission are carefully examined by naval officers, Post Captains and so forth, and are taken into the

Service as fit for duty. After they are commissioned, they pass out of the hands of the naval Captains into those of the officers who are to take charge of them, and it sometimes happens that those officers do make any alterations they may consider necessary. I am inclined to think that that practice ought to be swept away altogether. Surely those naval officers who examine the vessels prior to their going into commission, and who are in a responsible position, should be able to decide whether a ship is or is not fit to be commissioned; and when they have passed a ship as fit she ought to be maintained in the condition she was in when passed. I think a great deal of unnecessary expense is occasioned by the system at present adopted, and perhaps the First Lord will take the matter into his consideration. A gallant Admiral said just now something about the desirability of officers being appointed to vessels during the period of their instruction. I think it is advantageous in many cases that certain officers should be appointed to our ships; but we have heard some little in this House, and a great deal out of this House, about the mistake of sending officers into iron-clads without previous experience of them. It is contended that now-a-days our ships of war are of such a complicated nature that it is impossible for a person to understand a particular vessel unless he has been in it a long time. To gentlemen outside the Profession, undoubtedly our ships are complicated things; but it is a mistake to suppose that an officer brought up to the Profession would experience a difficulty in making himself thoroughly acquainted with any vessel afloat in Her Majesty's Service. It is absurd to suppose that you must be an officer an exceedingly long time in a ship in order to become acquainted with it, although I know the idea is one that is shared in by persons both in and out of this House. Those are the only observations I wish to make in regard to shipbuilding.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The hon. and gallant Gentleman who has just spoken has called my attention to certain practical points; and he has asked if it is necessary, in cases where repairs are imperatively demanded, that the Admiralty should first be informed of the matter, and that nothing should be done until their sanction has been received. Well, in my judgment, and in that of the present Board, there is more time wasted in connection with the repairs and alterations of ships than in any other matter. We think that whilst it is right that a certain latitude should be allowed to responsible officers at the Dockyards to incur expenditure it is desirable that before any expenditure, beyond a certain limit is incurred, the consent of the Admiralty should be obtained. I agree with the hon. and gallant Gentleman that no alteration should be allowed to take place in ships immediately after being placed in commission and under the direction of the officer in command. We are looking into the matter very carefully. As to coaling facilities, or rather attempts to facilitate the placing of coals on board ships, the question is one of the first to which the Admiralty will turn their attention as soon as they have completed the greater portion of the ships in progress. We are quite in accord with the hon. and gallant Member as regards the utility, if not the necessity, of introducing the electric light as much as possible on board Her Majesty's ships. Not only do they find that it makes men's lives pleasanter during the dark winter months; but, so far as I can ascertain, the electric light is far more economical than the old system of oil lamps. I now come to the important question that the hon. and gallant Member for Southampton (Sir John Commerell) dealt with, and that is the method by which Her Majesty's Government advertise for tenders, and the manner in which they conduct their contract business for the building of ships and for the construction of machinery and engines. My hon. and gallant Friend is under the impression that the Admiralty adhere to a close ring in this matter; but I can assure him that that is not the case. This question of tenders, however, is about as difficult a matter as any Department can satisfactorily deal with. You must, on the one hand, extend as far as possible the area of competition. If you publicly advertise for tenders you ought, in the majority of cases, to accept the lowest tender; but unless you can place absolute reliance upon the excellence of the work it is dangerous do so. If the Admiralty could do as the proprietors of the Atlantic Liners do, and deal only with a few firms, trusting them to build a certain number of ships, they would find that the reputation of the firms would be inseparably associated with those ships, the necessity of keeping up their reputation would cause the firms to supply the best work. If, however, you give a contract here and a contract there, the reputation of the builders is not so much bound up in the reputation of the vessels after they become a part of Her Majesty's Navy. We have to walk very circumspectly therefore, and the practice which has hitherto been adopted has been to place on the list for tenders all firms of established reputation, and to get these firms to compete whenever there is work to be done. In the great majority of instances the lowest tender is accepted. It is only under very exceptional circumstances, when a good report is made of the offer, that the lowest tender is not accepted. I do not see how the system can, with advantage, be altered. If the Admiralty were to take three or four of the best firms in England and confine their orders to them, I believe that the work performed would be more enduring, and that we should have better results than we have at present. But that is not a system which the House of Commons would tolerate, because it would be immediately said that the Admiralty were in league with these firms. You must increase the area of competition, and all we can do is to take every precaution and trouble that we can to see that when the tenders are accepted good and reliable work is done. Sir, my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South Sussex (Admiral Field) drew attention to the break-down of the engines of the *Phæton*, and seemed to think that the chief engineer, who was dismissed from his ship, was very harshly dealt with. But that is not the fact, because he had allowed his boilers to get into an exceedingly bad condition, and because it was the strain that was put upon the engines which was the original cause of the break-down. We are now having contract ships delivered into our hands, and we are determined that these vessels shall be fully and thoroughly tested as soon as possible, so that if there is any break-down or there are any defects in them the contractor may be held liable, and the defects made good at his expense. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Devonport (Captain Price) raised a very important question. He said—"You are building these large ships, two of which are in your own Dockyards, and two of which are under contract; they are no more nor less than floating gun carriages; but are you sure that you have reliable guns to place on board of them?" It is no use deploring the fact that we have had failures and disappointments with reference to our guns, failures and disappointments which prevent one from speaking in an over-sanguine spirit as to the future; but I have here a list of all guns which have failed in the Navy during the last few years, and all these guns, without an exception, are marked "One" or "Two." Neither of these is the pattern of heavy gun which will shortly be put on board the *Colossus* and the *Collingwood*, and which will replace the guns of the strength of which we are not satisfied. So far as I can ascertain, so far as experts can tell us, I believe these new guns are reliable. This question is one which must be carefully examined into, and I promise it shall have our unceasing attention. But I quite agree with my hon. and gallant Friend that unless we have confidence in our great guns we ought not to build ships on board of which to place them. I think I have now answered all the questions that have been put to me.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): No; not as to torpedoes.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The belted cruisers will have power to ram. The hon. and gallant Gentleman asked me if we were satisfied at the Admiralty with regard to the number of torpedoes provided in the Vote. Well, this is not the total number of torpedoes that is provided for the service of the present year. It is only for the number of torpedoes which we obtained from a certain firm. We found that there was no manufactory which could make what we required, so that last year the Admiralty came to an arrangement with an English firm who undertook to set up plant and machinery to carry out an order, and it is to pay for that order that this Vote is put down. I quite feel the great responsibility that devolves upon us in spending this enormous sum of money in seeing that it makes us a good return. I can assure the Committee that we will do our best to insure that in every way good and efficient work is obtained from the contractors, and that if any defects are found in their work they shall be brought to light in time in order to make the contractors make them good. As to the Nordenfelt submarine boat, we sent a very experienced officer last year to examine it. No doubt, the Nordenfelt submarine boat is the best of the kind that has yet been invented; but I dare say the hon. and gallant Gentleman who referred to it (Colonel Nolan), from his technical knowledge, is aware that the boat is not a complete and thorough success. Until it has been more perfected I do not think it would be advisable to enter upon the purchase of one or more, even though the expenditure involved should not be a very large one.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): Then, I take it that this is the policy of the Admiralty—not to spend any money upon submarine boats until they are convinced that they have got a perfect one? I do not suppose we shall ever have a submarine boat that is acknowledged to be perfect until two or three have been tried, and it therefore comes to this, that this country will not have purchased a submarine boat until some other country has adopted and completed one. These boats are about the only things which can upset guns and rams and everything else, and it seems to me a most dangerous thing for the Admiralty to shut their eyes to this latest development of naval science. You fear that if you bought one of these boats you would lose £10,000, or thereabouts, as it would not be a success; but, whatever the loss, I think you ought to obtain some experience in regard to these vessels. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Devonport (Captain Price) put a question as to whether these boats are not likely to go to the bottom. Well, it seems a very natural thing that a submarine boat should go down; but I would remind the hon. and gallant Member that one of these boats did go to the bottom three times and drowned the greater part of its crews, but at last it blew up one of the enemy's iron-clads. Even such a total failure as that vessel proved to be was, after all, much more expensive to the enemy than to its owners.

ADMIRAL MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I had not intended to make any remarks, and should not have done so had it not been for what has fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Devonport (Captain Price). I think it is not right that the public should be led to believe that the views of the hon. and gallant Member with regard to the vast importance of the torpedo are shared by the Naval Service generally. Having just returned from a cruise with the Channel Fleet, and from witnessing the manœuvres in Milford Haven, I believe I am correct in saying that, in the opinion of the officers commanding our ships, the value of torpedoes has been greatly overrated for many reasons of a technical nature. So confident are the officers of these ships of the protection afforded by torpedo nets, that the fact of the torpedo nets being down led the umpires at Milford to decide that a torpedo could not injure a ship. Ships are generally considered as being incapable of injury from torpedoes when the torpedo nets are down. I believe there would be found a general concensus of opinion in the Service that the power of a Whitehead torpedo is greatly overrated.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): I wish to draw the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to a very important question, and one which is very serious to those people who are the victims of naval manœuvres or experimental services. I wish to point out that the experiments which took place in Bantry Bay frequently resulted in inconvenience and loss to people living on shore. The playing of the electric light on shore caused cattle to stray, to destroy crops, and to fall over the cliffs, and the torpedo practice has had a very injurious effect on the fishing in Bantry Bay. At one time there were in that bay 12 sets of seines put out; but now, owing to the damage effected by the torpedoes, there are no fish to be had. Who is to recompense the fishing population for this loss? It is said that there is great recompense to the people through the circulation of so much Government money spent by the officers and seamen on shore; but in connection with that matter I should like to point out the significant circumstance that most frequently, when the Fleets leave these local waters, they sail on the day before the men are paid. The men are paid at sea or in England. I should like to ask the noble Lord whether in future, when these experiments are carried out, if it can be shown that injury has been done to the property in the neighbourhood the authorities will not consider it morally incumbent upon them to recognize their responsibility and make the damage good in some way or other? I will point out how they could recompense the sea-going population. In this very bay, where these experiments are carried on, and where so much naval knowledge is acquired, it is the fact—and attention has been directed to this matter by the hon. Gentleman who sits just below me, and who has frequently put Questions to Her Majesty's Ministers on the matter—that old anchors which are believed to have belonged to the French ships which once entered the bay, still lie there, and when fishing is carried on seriously injure the nets. The commanders of Her Majesty's ships would not undertake the experimental service—although it would have been a valuable exercise to them—of endeavouring to get these anchors out of the way of the fishermen. Then there is another useful work which they might have undertaken. Near the landing place, alongside of which the steam launches from the Fleet used to lie, there is an old sunken trawler which has been there for about two and a-half years. The steam launches of the ships of war used to pass this trawler, which is, of course, a great impediment to navigation. In fact, whilst the Fleet was there, 25 launches a-day would pass and repass this wreck, and yet no effort was made to get it out of the way. In connection with an experimental cruise, surely it would be well to teach the sailors of Her Majesty's Navy to experiment in some useful direction. If they had taken a few of the boys out of their ships and put them to the work of clearing away this wreck, it would have been a matter of education and training to them which, in future years, might have proved of service, because, some of these days, it may be absolutely needful for them to engage in work of this kind. I think that in return for the injury done to property in the neighbourhood—injury done to the fishing industry by the explosion of torpedoes and submarine mines, and to farmers and owners of cattle by the electric light—some labour should be expended by the Admiralty in making slips and quays which would be useful to the sea-going population on shore. I know I am rather out of Order in entering upon these matters, but I trust they will receive the favourable consideration of the Admiralty.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.): I also desire to direct the attention of the First Lord of the Admiralty to the fact that numerous complaints have been made by my constituents as to the injury done to their interests by Her Majesty's ships in Bantry Bay.

The CHAIRMAN: That subject has no connection with this Vote.

Mr. GILHOOLY: I thought that experimental practice was included under this Vote.

Mr. CONWAY (Leitrim, N.): I would draw attention to item E—£25,000 odd. £16,600 is for electric lighting purposes. I would wish to emphasize the point referred to by the hon. Gentleman who lately addressed the Committee (Mr. E. Harrington). I do not wish to allude particularly to pecuniary loss occasioned by experiments made by ships of war, but to loss of life occasioned by those experiments. Without going to Ireland, I would appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ormskirk (Mr. Forwood) on the subject of the experiments carried on at the mouth of the Mersey, near Liverpool. The electric light intensifies the darkness outside its radius; the light with which the experiments are made is not a fixed light, but a fugitive one, and ships sailing beneath it cannot discern each other, and it is complained that serious accidents are likely to occur. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. E. Harrington) has referred to pecuniary loss; but as there is a chance of danger to human life I think it only right to urge the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty to take such precautions as will prevent the occurrence of the calamities feared.

Mr. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): Am I right in supposing that this Vote is in reference to the construction of vessels? If so, I wish to call attention to the claim of Irish firms for work of this kind. I am under the impression that a contract was given to the Belfast firm of Messrs. Harland and Wolff for the construction of some small vessel. I presume that vessel has been finished —that it has been constructed and delivered over to the Admiralty. I am curious to know whether the work of this Irish firm has turned out to the satisfaction of the Department? I also wish to make an inquiry of the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) as to the particulars of his visit to Cork Harbour and the Victoria Docks at Passage, where he entered into a minute inspection of the capacity of the docks for building small vessels, and where he expressed his satisfaction at the capabilities of the place, and the excellence of the machinery he found there. I believe I am right in saying that the First Lord, and those who accompanied him, led the people in that place to believe that they might expect an order for some such vessels as those constructed by Messrs. Harland and Wolf. That intimation, if such were given, has not been carried out; and I desire to know from the First Lord what his feelings on the question are at the present moment? I have no doubt that the Belfast people have given satisfaction to the Admiralty equal to that given by the other private firms to whom has been entrusted the building of these swift and excellent vessels; and I wish to know how far the noble Lord is prepared to go in giving out contracts for similar vessels to firms in Ireland capable of turning them out satisfactorily? Work of this kind would be a great boon to Passage, where there are a number of skilled artizans unemployed, and where, according to the noble Lord's own admission, there are docks of good capacity supplied with machinery which met with his warm approval. I would point out that it would be a gracious act if he could see his way in future to giving more contracts to Ireland, whether it be in the North or South—whether it be to Messrs. Harland and Wolff, or to the Victoria Docks at Passage. Such an act on the part of the noble Lord would be accepted in a good spirit; and I have no doubt that if the noble Lord would act in that sympathetic manner he manifested on the occasion to which I refer, he would be doing that which would be as much to his own credit as to the advantage of Ireland.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): In connection with the subject which has been so ably brought before the Committee by my hon. Friend the Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Conner), I would call the attention of the noble Lord to the fact that not only are there ample opportunities afforded by the Yard at Passage for the construction of ships, but that moreover there is a point to which he might easily pay attention which comes under this very heading—"Repairs and Alteration of Ships, Machinery, and Stores." There are a great many of Her Majesty's ships which enter Cork waters which might be very easily repaired at these docks, but which are not repaired there. To my certain knowledge, even the small gunboats which could be easily docked and repaired at Passage, where there are great facilities, and where the work of repairing would be attended with a lowering of expense and a saving to the country, are sent across to one or other of the large docks on the South Coast of England. I maintain that these boats could obtain at Passage all the necessary repairing which they are now sent across the water to obtain. By the present system the country must incur unnecessary expense, for these ships must be sent to Plymouth or Devonport; and I feel sure that if the noble Lord would look into the item, and see how the work can be done, he will agree with the force of this observation. He has seen the Passage Establishment himself, and he will shortly have an opportunity of revisiting it. Last year he expressed himself as thoroughly satisfied with the establishment and staff, and with the low prices—so satisfied that he gave a contract there. It was only a small contract; but knowing the establishment, and having been on the spot—knowing thus in the most certain manner what this firm is capable of doing—I sincerely hope the noble Lord will be able to increase the trade of this establishment by giving a still larger contract in the course of the ensuing year. I was rather struck by the few observations which fell from the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Admiral Mayne), who had only just come into the House, and who stated that he had only just arrived from Milford Haven. His remarks on the subject of torpedoes are remarks in which we must all have felt the deepest interest. I feel sorry that we did not have the result of this torpedo practice sooner, for the torpedoes for which we are asked to pay this special sum before the House will be used, or are intended to be used, in the defence of our commercial harbours, which subject was under the consideration of the Committee yesterday. If this is the case, and if torpedoes are now practically found to be useless against first or second class ships, it is nothing more nor less than a waste of money to pass the item for torpedoes. I sincerely hope the noble Lord will be able, in process of time, to lay on the Table of the House some practical results which have been obtained by these experiments. Again, dealing with the electric light, I think that, as far as we can see, everyone who does not happen to belong to the Service whose Estimates are at the present moment under consideration, has come to the conclusion that this method of illumination, as at present applied in Her Majesty's Navy, has been not altogether satisfactory. I think more attention ought to be paid to this particular subject, because we have seen that in the past the electric light has been stated to be altogether useless. If the light can be made useful at all, it would be, I should think, as a head light on ships, because anyone who has ever been to sea knows that unfortunately in foggy weather the lights displayed by Her Majesty's ships of war are not at all times visible. Owing to the fact that the system of lighting on board Her Majesty's ships is not what it should be on many occasions collisions have occurred. I feel perfectly certain that if the noble Lord and the Admiralty could take cognizance of this subject, and would really cause more attention to be paid to this electrical department, and particularly to the head lights on board ship, that they would be doing a work of material benefit, and one which, I feel sure, the country would only be too glad to endorse. As to the Nordenfelt submarine boats which were referred to by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan), there is no doubt that in the first series of experiments the boats went to the bottom. We were told by the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty that because the boats went to the bottom no further experiments were to be tried by Her Majesty's Government. But that principle has not been adopted in the Navy hitherto. We have not ceased to build ships because those which we have constructed have gone to the bottom. Many of our largest vessels have gone down, notably Her Majesty's ship *Captain*, and I sincerely hope that, looking at the many failures we have experienced in connection with large items of expenditure when our large ships have again and again gone to the bottom—[*Laughter*]—that in small matters like the construction of experimental submarine boats we shall not be afraid of spending a little money. Hon. Gentlemen may laugh; but supposing a war breaks out to-morrow and you send a Fleet into the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, or the Levant, and supposing Russia has one of these Nordenfelt boats which she has improved and made workable, Her Majesty's Government may very uncomfortably awake to the fact that another Power has been before her. Unfortunately, in the annals of the British Navy we have usually acquired wisdom by bitter experience dearly bought—we have purchased the knowledge of the fact that we are behindhand, and have not taken sufficient advantage of the inventions of foreigners. You may take it from the beginning to the end of the book, from the first page to the last, that the annals of the British Navy are studded with records of our incapacity in the scientific branch of the Service. I hope, however, that in this matter the House will take time by the forelock and will not be caught napping again.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.): I propose to move the reduction of the Vote by £23,000, unless I get an undertaking from the First Lord of the Admiralty that where damage shall be done in future by Her Majesty's ships in Bantry Bay in the course of their experiments—and I refer to damage both in regard to the killing of fish, the trampling down of crops on the farms adjacent to the bay, and knocking down the fences—compensation will be paid to the poor people whose fish or crops are destroyed, or whose fences are knocked down. I also ask for an undertaking that the system of "Boycotting" which has been practised by Her Majesty's ships in Irish ports will not be allowed to continue. It is believed that the sailors are paid in English ports——

THE CHAIRMAN: The subject the hon. Member is now referring to, I must point out, is not quite pertinent to the Vote under discussion.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I can assure the hon. Gentleman that where damage is done it will be made good. I must point out, however, that the explosion of torpedoes or submarine mines, though they may destroy fish for a time, will not absolutely clear them out of the place for ever. The fish will return. Under any circumstances, I think the officers in command of ships should be instructed not to interfere with the rights of property.

MR. GILHOOLY: Will the noble Lord give an undertaking that compensation will be paid?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: As to the appeal made to me on behalf of the Shipbuilding Company at Passage, it is quite true that I paid a visit to the establishment last year; but I cannot have expressed myself there as I thought I had if I left behind me the impression which has been put before the Committee. The claims of this place, however, will be fairly considered in conjunction with those of other private Dockyards.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £8,400, to complete the sum for Martial Law, &c.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): How about the Vote for Medical Stores? Is it passed over?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): It is postponed.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Till when?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: To-morrow.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £134,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of various Miscellaneous Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

MR. R. W. DUFF (Banffshire): On this Vote I believe I shall be in Order in asking if the noble Lord has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Committee on the Education of Naval Executive Officers? It is a matter of considerable importance to the Service; and I know that in the opinion of the late First Lord of the Admiralty it would strengthen the hands of the Admiralty to have this information laid before the House.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I should like the hon. Gentleman to put that Question to me in a few days. I should like to have time to consider what the precedents are. It is a matter that I think ought to be made public, and I shall consider it with the view, if possible, of laying the Report on the Table.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness): There is an item with regard to depreciation of pay on the India and China Station that I should like to have an explanation of.

CAPTAIN PRICE (Devonport): If it is allowable to regret a diminution of expenditure in any case, I think, perhaps, it might be allowed to regret the diminution of expenditure in aid of religious and charitable institutions. I notice that this year there is a decrease to the extent of £250 in this item. The whole amount which the Admiralty pays towards these institutions is very small indeed. I do not wish to argue that it should be largely increased; but there are some of these institutions which I think are very well worth the consideration of the Admiralty—notably the Female Orphan Asylum at Devonport. That is a very old and a very useful Institution, well known throughout the country as having done good work for many years. At that Institution are supported a large number of female orphans of soldiers and sailors. It is the case that a certain amount was granted in aid of that establishment out of the Greenwich Hospital Fund; but, after all, the money that is taken from the Greenwich Hospital Fund is money that is really taken out of the pockets of the men, and is not a sum granted from the Imperial Exchequer. I do not for a moment say that it is wrong to appropriate a certain amount of money from the

Greenwich Hospital Fund for that purpose; I think it is quite right, but I think this money should be supplemented to a greater extent than it is at present out of the Imperial Fund. The establishment at Devonport is, as I say, one that is well known and understood, and everyone will allow that it is a most useful establishment. With regard to the item for medals I should like to know from the authorities whether the medals have been given out to the Marines for their services in Egypt? They were not given out a few months ago, and I should like to know whether they have been given out since? As to Sub-head W, I should have liked to make some remarks upon it, but I find the time is running very short. I would remind hon. Gentlemen that I have only alluded incidentally to the subject of that Vote. I think it is a great pity that our Naval Service is so badly represented on the Continent. I believe there is only one naval officer to do all the work there—to get up all the information as to what is going on. It is perfectly impossible that one man can make himself thoroughly acquainted with what is going on in all the Naval Dockyards of the Continent. I hope that attention will be paid to this matter, and that, if possible, the Intelligence Department of the Navy will be increased.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I perfectly agree that if our Navy intelligence is insufficient, that immediate steps ought to be taken to increase it; but we have confidence in the gallant captain who is now discharging that duty. Still, he has a large amount of work to do, and we have instructed him that the first and most important of his duties is that of the extension of the Department so as to provide us with the intelligence as to the condition of Foreign Navies and Foreign Services. With regard to charitable institutions, the hon. and gallant Member (Captain Price) has drawn attention to an institution which is somewhere in Devonshire. Well, there are similar institutions elsewhere, in the neighbourhood of our Dockyard towns, and, of course, we have to share between them whatever sum we have to give. I can, however, assure him that the subject will receive every attention. The hon. and gallant Member for the East Riding of Yorkshire (Commander Bethell) asked me for an explanation with regard to a loss made on the exchange in India and China. It makes up the balance of payments which the accountants are compelled to make, and also losses on coins which come to their hands, and which they have to hand over to the officers and men at a certain value. It is not a question of rate of exchange; but we are going to look into it, and put the thing on a more satisfactory footing, if we can.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.): I wish to put a Question to the noble Lord with regard to allowances to ministers of religion. Yesterday I put a Question on this subject on the Army Estimates. Ministers of three denominations are provided for—Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian; but it seems to me that there is a tendency, officially, to ignore all other minor sects. It may be satisfactory to the official denominations that the minor sects should be ignored; but there is no satisfaction to be derived from this by those who, like myself, belong to these minor sects. In connection with this item I would ask the noble Lord whether there are any Methodist seamen on shore, at home, or abroad; and, if there are, whether they receive the religious ministrations of clergymen of their own denomination? If they do, I should like to know is it at the cost of the State, and whether the amount is included in the present Vote? I would also ask the noble Lord whether, in the future, he will give public recognition to Methodist and other sects that receive public money? I think that if the ministers of these other sects do not receive public money for their ministrations amongst the seamen and troops they ought to do so, and that where public money is paid these clergymen should receive public recognition by name of denomination in Estimates and public records.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The number of men in the Service who belong to the denominations referred to by the hon. Member is about 7 per cent, and an arrangement is made in regard to those men, whereby a capitation grant is made to the clergymen according to the number who attend their chapels. That arrangement, so far, has worked very well. These clergymen have no official position in the Navy, but naval officers always recognize them in their ministrations amongst the men.

MR. JORDAN: There are Methodist chaplains in Dublin, the Curragh, and elsewhere in Ireland, and my observations referred to the future official recognition of the clergymen attached to these naval and military stations.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.): It will be remembered that a gunboat called the *Seahorse* ran ashore some time ago whilst engaged in conveying soldiers and a Sheriff to Tory Island for the purpose of carrying out evictions. An undertaking was given by a Member of Her Majesty's late Government that no gunboats would be used for the purpose of carrying troops and Sheriffs to the Isle of Skye. I want to impress on the Committee that it is cruel in the extreme to allow the use of gunboats for these expeditions in Ireland when it is not permitted in Scotland.

THE CHAIRMAN: That subject has nothing whatever to do with the Vote.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I should like to know why £10,000 is included in the account for the construction of docks in Hong Kong, and why it is not included in the ordinary Estimates?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: It is a subsidy from the Government.

MR. J. O'CONNOR: (Tipperary, S.): There is a sub-head showing losses to the country by shipwreck, and I think that on this a discussion has been very fairly raised by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Gilhooly). The *Seahorse* was lost——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is entering into a discussion that is entirely wide of the Vote.

MR. J. O'CONNOR: I wish to ask whether the gunboat which started from Westport the other day on a similar errand will, if she should get wrecked whilst on that dangerous cruise, and in the discharge of such reprehensible duty, be brought formally under the notice of this House——

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [7th September] *reported.*

First Resolution *postponed.*

Subsequent Resolutions *agreed to.*

Postponed Resolution to be considered *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 9th September, 1886.

MINUTES.] — PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS — *Second Reading*—Electric Lighting * (13). *Third Reading*—Local Government (No. 7) * (3); Local Government (No. 8) * (4); Local Government (No. 9) * (5); Local Government (No. 10) * (6); Local Government (No. 11) * (7); Local Government (Ireland) (Public Health Act) (No. 2) * (8); Local Government (Highways) * (168); Local Government (No. 5) * (172), and *passed.*

BULGARIA—REPORTED ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.—QUESTION.

EARL DE LA WARR: I rise to ask the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government can give any information with regard to the alleged abdication of the Prince of Bulgaria, and the steps which have been taken by the European Powers?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): My Lords, I do not know that I can give any further information with regard to the abdication of the Prince of Bulgaria than what has appeared generally in the public newspapers. The communications we have received are very much in the same sense, and they show that at the last, the Prince, having satisfied himself by inquiries which he made that his position in Bulgaria was one that he could not satisfactorily maintain, appointed a Regency, to whose hands he made over his dignity. He was received at and conducted from Sofia with great respect and with marks of great affection, and there is no doubt that the manner of his leaving the country was dignified and worthy of the great reputation which he had won for himself. This close to the incident is in worthy contrast to the terrible outrage which shocked so thoroughly the public mind. As to the future, I am not in a position at present to say anything. No doubt the arrangements that will have to be made in consequence of the abdication of the Prince will be made in accordance with the Treaty of Berlin, and with arrangements made subsequently at the Conference dealing with the matter; and I do not apprehend that there will be any advantage in entering into any speculations with regard to the course which may be taken.

Subsequently,

Lord STRATHEDEN and CAMPBELL, who had a Notice on the Paper, "To call attention to the occurrences in Bulgaria; and ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether they are yet prepared to make a statement with regard to them?" said, the noble Earl opposite (Earl De La Warr) had in some degree—in a manner which was exceedingly obliging—rather anticipated his Notice, and had succeeded in drawing a reply from the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He would in no way press the Question he desired to ask unless it seemed to the Government that it would be conducive to their policy to extend the statement which had been made. It was with no idea of embarrassing the Government that he had placed the Notice on the Paper.

The Earl of IDDESLEIGH: I appreciate the courtesy of the noble Lord in not pressing his Question, and in the observations he has made. It is quite natural that there should be a desire that some words should be said in this House to show the interest taken in the recent occurrences in Bulgaria, and also to explain the position occupied by Her Majesty's Government. After what I have already said in presence of the House, I do not think it is necessary or desirable that I should go further into the matter at the present time. Very full accounts have been given in the newspapers of what has passed, and I am able to confirm the information they contain. We are now approaching the time when some arrangements will have to be made for the appointment of a Successor to Prince Alexander; but I think at the present moment it would be rather inconvenient than otherwise to make any further statement on the subject.

MALTA—THE DOCKYARDS—EMPLOYMENT OF MALTESE SUBJECTS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Earl DE LA WARR, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether there are any special orders or regulations relative to the employment of Maltese subjects of Her Majesty in the dockyards at Malta or otherwise as seamen in the Royal Navy; also, whether there is any objection to laying Papers on that subject upon the Table of the House? said, from private information which had reached him, as well as from statements which had been made in the public Press, he was led to believe that orders or regulations had been issued relative to the employment of Maltese subjects of Her Majesty in the Dockyards and Naval Departments at Malta, or otherwise as seamen in the Royal Navy. It was a question which was naturally one of great interest and importance to the Maltese people, and he hoped Her Majesty's Government would not object to say what regulations were in existence with regard to the employment of Maltese British subjects in the Dockyards of Malta and the various Departments connected with them, and also as to their being employed as seamen, firemen, and generally in the Royal Navy—whether, he might say, as regarded employment, they were placed upon the same footing as other subjects of Her Majesty? He believed there was but one opinion, that the Maltese were good sailors, and that it was not easy to find men who worked better or as well as they did. He wished in a few words to point out that any subject relating to employment and labour in Malta was one of special interest and importance, and for this reason, the population had been for a long time increasing without a corresponding increase in the demand for labour. The resources of the Island were limited, he would not say incapable of further development, for he believed they would be greatly improved if there were more freedom of action in the administration of civil affairs, and that too without weakening the position of Malta as a fortress. But independently of these considerations the increase of population was becoming a matter of great anxiety. Emigration was already largely resorted to, but it could not go beyond a certain point, and if they looked to the relations of this country towards Malta, the circumstances of its annexation, and its great importance as a Naval and Military Station, these considerations seemed to demand that there should be at least equality of employment for the Maltese, when qualified for it, with their fellow British subjects. He could understand it was possible that difficulties might in some instances exist with regard to the use of the Maltese language, a language little used except by the Maltese themselves; but if it were found that a knowledge of English would afford greater facilities for employment in the Dockyards and Royal Navy generally, there was little doubt that it would tend much to promote the study of the English language. Knowing as he did something of the Maltese people and their hardworking and industrious habits, he believed they might be made of great service as sailors in the British Navy. If taken when young and trained, as they might well be at Malta, they would become a valuable addition to the Naval Service of the country, while at the same time employment, which was so much needed, would be afforded for the population of one of the most important Dependencies of the British Empire. He wished to ask if there were any Papers relating to the employment of the Maltese in the Dockyards or otherwise in the Royal Navy which could be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord HARRIS) (who replied) said: There are special regulations relative to the employment of Maltese as seamen in the Royal Navy. They were established with a view of restricting the entries of Maltese to the non-combatant branches of the Service. It is contrary to precedent to lay Papers of this character before the House. There are no special regulations with regard to employment of Maltese in the Dockyards. As a matter of fact, they form by far the largest proportion of the working staff of the Dockyards.

LEASEHOLDERS (IRELAND).

RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM, in obtaining leave to withdraw the following Notice:—

> "To call attention to the social disorder arising from the unequal rental and land tenure under Trinity College, Dublin; and to move that the triple ownership of land should be equitably terminated;"

rose to move—

> "That in the opinion of this House all leaseholders in Ireland who at the natural expiration of their leases will come under the Land Act of 1881, or who may be subject to a fluctuation of rent during the term of their lease, should have access to the Land Commissioners for the adjustment of their rents."

In doing so, the noble Earl said, that there was an agitation in Ireland on this subject which had made great progress, and which had met with the approval of many Members of Parliament belonging to all Parties, who were pledged to vote next Session for legislation in the direction in which his Motion pointed. The present position of affairs with regard to leaseholders in Ireland was exceedingly undesirable and ought to be terminated at once. There was no analogy between Irish leases and English and Scotch leases. Their origin was entirely different. An English landlord equipped the farm which he let on lease, whereas the Irish leaseholder equipped the farm, building his house and offices, and probably even laying out the land. Having equipped his farm it could hardly be expected that the Irish leaseholder should lose his interest in the farm at the expiration of the lease. In fact, Parliament by the Land Act of 1881 had adopted that view and had given the tenant the power to apply to the Commissioners, if he could hold on for a time, to extend his lease for a period of 15 years at a judicial rent. It would, therefore, be seen that his proposal merely anticipated by a short time what would eventually occur if the tenants could but hold on. It might be asked—"Why do these people wish to break their contracts?" He justified such a breach of contract on the ground that the basis of all Irish land legislation for the last 20 years had been that the Irish tenant was not free to contract. If, then, the ordinary Irish tenant was not free to contract, why should it be supposed that the poor leaseholder was free? These leases for the most part had been entered upon for various reasons. There was, for example, general insecurity of tenure, and rents were being constantly put up and raised capriciously and sometimes unjustly; and, again, the tenants might have wished to protect themselves against possible new landlords. In order to avoid these and other contingencies the tenant might have entered upon a lease. He maintained, therefore, that outside pressure and insecurity had deprived the tenant of freedom to contract. There was good reason, then, for a revision of the leases. It was rather hard that tenants who had been granted by Parliament a distinct prospective interest in their holdings, should, through the present bad times and perfectly unforeseen circumstances, lose that very substantial prospect of interest which Parliament had given them. He appealed to their Lordships to do justice to the Irish leaseholders. Even Trinity College, Dublin, had issued ejectments against their leaseholders, or at least against one leaseholder, and had taken other action which had been the cause of social disorder in the districts affected for the last 18 months or two years. On a previous occasion when he brought this subject before their Lordships Lord Ashbourne stated it would probably never be heard of again. The noble Lord never made a greater mistake in his life. It was his intention, and the intention of those who thought with him, to stick to the matter until it was set right, and he hoped that Her Majesty's Government would see the wisdom of settling it. The noble Earl concluded by moving the Motion of which he had given Notice.

Moved, "That in the opinion of this House all leaseholders in Ireland who at the natural expiration of their leases will come under the Land Act of 1881, or who may be subject to a fluctuation of rent during the term of their lease, should have access to the Land Commissioners for the adjustment of their rents."—(*The Earl of Leitrim.*)

THE EARL OF HOWTH said, that this subject affected a large number of Irishmen who, like himself, were interested in leasehold property, and he wished, therefore, to make one or two observations in reference to the statement of the noble Earl (the Earl of Leitrim) who had just sat down. He did not in any way desire to obstruct legislation on this question, but the period had certainly not come for such legislation. There were many circumstances connected with the question which could not be properly stated at two or three days' Notice. As an instance of this, he might mention that when the Crofters Bill was under discussion the question of leaseholders was not dealt with in the Act. The Motion of the noble Earl recognized no equality whatever between the landlord and tenant. According to the Resolution, the tenant had very full opportunity of bringing his landlord into Court; but he did not see that the landlord had the same facility. He was himself a Liberal, and in "another place" he had supported the Land Bill of 1870 and had given a full consent to several points in the Land Bill of 1881. He would divide leaseholders into five classes. In the first were the rich tenants, who had large incomes independent of their leases. In the second were those who had other sources of income besides agriculture—he referred to the large grass owners. In the third were the middlemen, who certainly did not bear a very good name in the country, though he did not desire to say anything against the noble Earl, who was a middleman. There were a great many vacant seats on that (the Liberal) side of the House, and after this Motion of the noble Earl he anticipated that next Session they should see him occupying one of the seats. He thought, however, that a great many of the misfortunes which had occurred in Ireland were owing to middlemen. In the fourth class were the tenants who had nothing but land to depend upon, and with whom he had much sympathy. In the fifth class were the tenants who held small pieces of land, and upom whom, from various causes, leases had been forced. If in any case leases were to be broken it was in the case of this class. Speaking according to English ideas and legal opinion, he supposed contracts to be sacred. When the case of the crofters was dealt with in "another place" and the question of leases came to be considered they were not allowed to be broken. If that privilege was not accorded to the crofters of Scotland it was very hard on the Irish landlord that his leases should be broken by gentlemen who might have £500 or £600 a-year. He thought the Irish landlords could demand with perfect justice that it should be shown whether they had treated their tenants well or ill, or whether they had evicted. It ought to be remembered that at a period when things were very different from what they were now these leasehold contracts were highly valued. In 1870 these contracts were held in such high estimation that the Government, desirous to make their Bill acceptable to the farmers of the country, instead of treating lightly contracts between landlords and tenants, exempted those who were under such contracts from the provisions of the Bill. From 1870 to 1881 the relations between landlords and leaseholders were upon their trial; and he believed the landlords had not been found wanting in consideration for their leaseholding tenants. On an estate with which he was acquainted there were a number of leaseholders, and on the renewal of leases which fell in instructions were given to go back to the rents of 1854. That showed that the interests of the tenants were considered by the landlords.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl CADOGAN) said, that when he saw the two Notices placed upon the Paper, although they were different in form and in scope, he came to the conclusion that they were both directed to the examination of the same subject—namely, that of the perpetuity tenants holding under Trinity College, Dublin—a subject which the noble Earl (the Earl of Leitrim) had on four previous occasions brought under the notice of the House. He had introduced two Bills—one a Private Bill, and the other a Public Bill—both of which were rejected; and he had also moved for inquiries both by Commission and by Committee, the second being so late as March of the present year. The noble Earl had not that day gone very far in his remarks before he found himself discussing the position of the leaseholds under Trinity College, Dublin. The noble Earl had, however, withdrawn the first Resolution, and, therefore, it was not necessary to follow him in the remarks he had made upon it. With regard to the second and larger Resolution, the noble Earl had scarcely appreciated the scope of the wording of his Motion. If it were carried, it would bring under the Act of 1881 all leaseholders—including those whose rents fluctuated — whether they were occupiers or not, whether they were agricultural or not, whether they were in town or country. Under the Land Act of 1881 the word tenant was defined to mean a person who occupied a holding under a contract for a tenancy, and the whole machinery of the Law Courts was adapted only to cases where the tenant was also the occupier. Therefore, the change proposed by the noble Earl was one of great extent, and would be one very far-reaching in its results; and he would put it to their Lordships whether, under the present circumstances, it would be possible to give effect to a Resolution of this sort, which had been brought forward at a very short Notice and in so small a House? He thought that the noble Earl had probably achieved his main object in obtaining an opportunity of making remarks on the subject. He had, in a speech of considerable ability, laid once more before their Lordships his views, and he had been, to a great extent, answered by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Howth). Under these circumstances, it was his duty, on the part of the Government, to express their inability to accept the Resolution, and he ventured to hope that the noble Earl would not press the Motion he had made to a division.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM said, that the noble Earl (Earl Cadogan) had adroitly avoided the first part of the Resolution, and both noble Lords appeared to doubt his sincerity on that part of the subject. He (the Earl of Leitrim) was not in the habit of saying one thing and meaning another, and he was of opinion that leaseholders were suffering great hardships in spite of all that had been said from the opposite Benches. The Motion referred to leaseholders suffering from high rents, and, as a rule, the high rents had been arrived at since the passing of the Act of 1870. The date in the Act ought to have been 1869 instead of 1870, because a number of leases were forced upon tenants with a view of avoiding the Act before it was passed. In speaking of intimidation, he did not bring anything like a general charge; and he admitted that there were landlords who had given leases with the best intentions and the best results. Still the very fact mentioned, that a landlord had put back the rents to what they were in 1854, bore testimony to the hardship of many existing rents. From the point of view of the landlords, he maintained that it was desirable that this question should be settled. His own instructions were that leaseholders should be put upon the same level as ordinary agricultural tenants.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

POST OFFICE—POSTAGE OF PRINTED MATTER.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN asked, Why printed matter enclosed in an envelope open at the sides is charged a higher rate of postage than the same matter enclosed in a similar envelope open at the ends; and, further, how it is decided which are to be regarded as the sides and which as the ends in case of an envelope which is square?

THE PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of SALISBURY) (who replied) said, he regretted that he was unable to give his noble Friend any useful or conclusive answer to the Question. He was informed that the Post Office Authorities were wholly unable to understand the Question; but he was desired to say that if the noble Earl would be kind enough to furnish specimens of what he meant, they would be glad to afford any further information in their power for his satisfaction.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, the Post Office Regulations required that, for the purposes of the book post, both ends of the envelope should be open; but he was informed that if, instead, the sides were left open the full rate of postage was charged. The Post Office officials themselves decided which were the sides and which the ends of an envelope, and in some instance charged the full rate if what they considered the sides were left open instead of the ends, the object, of course, being that the contents should be open to inspection. He was at a loss to understand why the sides, which were larger than the ends, should not be considered equally available for the purpose.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY repeated that if the necessary information were supplied the postal officials would further inquire into the matter.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 9th September, 1886.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES; CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 21, 22; CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS, Votes 1 to 12; NAVY ESTIMATES, Votes 12, 13, 14

Postponed Resolution [September 7] *considered* and *agreed to.*

Resolutions [September 8] *reported.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*) — *Second Reading* — Kingstown and Kingsbridge Junction Railway.*

PUBLIC BILL — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Submarine Telegraph Act (1885) Amendment * [45].

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE—RATES FOR TELEGRAMS TO THE CONTINENT.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) asked the Postmaster General, If he can explain why telegrams to the Continent of Europe cost so much more than the total of telegraph charges in the Countries through which they pass, e.g., why it is that while in the British Islands, France, and Switzerland, telegrams cost about one halfpenny per per word in each Country, a telegram from England to Switzerland is charged 3½*d.* per word; whether private Companies are paid for cabling messages across the Channel, and at what rates, or whether the Government possesses any cable across the Channel to Europe; if not, whether, considering the short distance and small cost of such cables, he will establish one so that (as in the case of Ireland) the public may not pay an exorbitant toll to Cable Companies; and, whether he will try to arrange to put International telegrams on a footing more nearly in proportion to International letters, or at least on a scale not higher than the aggregate domestic charge of the Countries through which they pass?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that the charges for foreign telegrams are settled at the International Conferences which take place every five years; and some countries are not willing to transmit such telegrams at rates so low as those which they charge for inland telegrams. The charges for inland telegrams in different countries vary in principle as well as in amount; but, to meet the convenience of the public, the charges for foreign telegrams are everywhere based on the same principle, which is that of a word-rate pure and simple. The Post Office has not lost any opportunity of endeavouring to bring about reductions in the charges; and, both at the Conference in Berlin last year and at the previous Conference in London, considerable reductions were made. The charge to Switzerland, I ought to say, is 3½*d.*, not 4*d.* The Government possesses three cables to the Continent—two to Holland and one to Germany. The cables to France and Belgium are the property of the Submarine Telegraph Company, who possess exclusive rights as regards those countries until the end of the year 1888. The cables of the Government are worked by the Submarine Company under an agreement sanctioned by Parliament which has not yet expired.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERIES DISPUTE—THE TREATY OF 1871.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can state in what particular points the Articles of the Fishery Treaty (1871) are alleged to have been infringed by American and Canadian fishermen; how far the commercial privileges embodied in Articles 30 and 31 have been carried out; and, whether any money award was made to this Country under Article 22 of the Treaty?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Treaty of 1871 is not in question. The Fishery Articles of that Treaty expired in 1885 (see Parliamentary Paper, United States, No. 3, 1884). Article 30, concerning the Coasting Trade and Transit Duties, has also expired. Arrangements were made in 1873 to carry it out, and, consequentially, Article 31 (see Parliamentary Paper, North America, No. 12, 1873). A sum of $5,500,000 was paid to Her Majesty's Governmeat pursuant to Article 22 of the Treaty of 1871 (see Parliamentary Paper, North America, No. 4, 1878). The present difficulties with the United States turn on the construction of the Convention of 1818, which has been revived by the expiry of the Articles above mentioned of the (Washington) Treaty of 1871.

THE WEST INDIAN COLONIES AND THE UNITED STATES—A COMMERCIAL TREATY.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, What measures he intends adopting for the purpose of bringing about a Commercial Treaty between this Country, the West Indian Colonies, and the United States?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The Papers presented to Parliament last year show the circumstances in which it was then not found practicable to come to any arrangement, and up to this time there has been no change in the conditions of the question.

MECHANICS' INSTITUTES—SUPPLY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS.

MR. WRIGHT (Lancashire, S.W., Leigh) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the Government will sanction the expense of supplying Parliamentary Reports of Education, Crime, Pauperism, County Expenditure, and other Returns connected with County Government, also Returns of Army and Navy Estimates, to free libraries and mechanics' institutions?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I have examined carefully into this matter, and, to a considerable extent, I am in sympathy with the object of the hon. Gentleman. I think it must be admitted that it would be to the advantage of the Government establishments that free libraries should be encouraged by a *quasi*-State recognition, and it is also obvious that it is to the advantage of the State that people should have ready access to official information as supplied by State and Parliamentary literature. The hon. Member will perceive that the Government must draw a broad distinction between free libraries and mechanics' institutions, free libraries being establishments moderate in number and well defined, and mechanics' institutions being of many sorts and also very numerous. As far as free libraries are concerned, what I propose is this—that they should apply to the Treasury for such Parliamentary documents as they may be of opinion will be of advantage to the persons who frequent them; and I will engage next year to bring before the House an Estimate to defray the charge of supplying those documents gratis, and then leave it to the House to decide whether they think the expenditure ought to be incurred or not. The total charge for all Parliamentary Papers incurred by any individual or association who wishes to possess them would be £20 a-year under the present arrangement. The First Lord of the Treasury in the late Conservative Government made an arrangement by which free libraries could be supplied with these Papers at a discount of 25 per cent, which would bring the charge down to £15 a-year for free libraries. If, therefore, the Government were to supply every free library with all Parliamentary literature, the cost would be somewhere about £2,000 a-year. But I imagine that there is a large portion of Parliamentary literature which free libraries would not care to possess, and, therefore, I think it will be right to let them apply to the Treasury for such literature as they may require, and then let the House decide whether the cost should be incurred or not.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES—THE CONFEDERATION —NOVA SCOTIA.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether information has reached showing that the people of Nova Scotia are opposed to the confederate form of Government under which they live; whether they have made several attempts to secure more favourable terms from the Home Government; whether their prayers for reform have been refused; whether in consequence they have expressed their desire for Legislative independence; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will grant this request?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Her Majesty's Government received, in June last, a despatch from Lord Lansdowne, enclosing a Resolution which had been recently carried by a majority in the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, advocating withdrawal from the Dominion of Canada, but no subsequent communication on the subject has been received. Some Correspondence also took place on the subject in 1868, which will be found in a Parliamentary Paper dated June 10, 1868. Her Majesty's Government have no power to alter the terms of the British North America Act, 1867, which was settled with the assistance of delegates from Nova Scotia, and was subsequently approved by the Legislature of that Province. I may add that we have every confidence that the Dominion Parliament will desire to redress, as far as possible, any reasonable grievances of which a Province may complain.

IRELAND—THE KINGSTOWN "BIRD'S NEST"—DETENTION OF CHILDREN.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the occurrence last week at the Kingstown "Bird's Nest," in connection with the four children of the Army pensioner M'Greil; and, if the Government will take steps to have the child who is still detained restored to his mother?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: I have read an account of the occurrence last week at the institution called the Kingstown "Bird's Nest" referred to in the Question of the hon. Baronet. I am informed that the child mentioned, with the other children, was placed in the institution by his father in June last; and, under such circumstances, the Government have no power to interfere as to his custody.

THE CURRENCY, &c.—THE GOLD COINAGE.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, having reference to the present unsatisfactory condition of the gold currency, Her Majesty's Government propose to take any steps in the matter?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): Of course the matter has been under my consideration, but it is a very large and very difficult subject. I have not been long enough at the Exchequer as yet to be able to give the hon. Baronet a definite answer. I may, however, allow myself to say this much, that if anything is to be done to rehabilitate the gold coinage of the country it must be done at the cost of the State. If that be so, the sums required, although spread over a series of years, will be considerable, and it will be impossible for me finally to decide whether I shall submit a proposal to the House of Commons until I am more fully in possession of what the balance of Revenue and Expenditure for next year is likely to be.

CIVIL SERVICE CLERKS AND WRITERS —REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the alterations, as to Civil Service Clerks, in the Playfair Scheme, stated by the Secretary to the Treasury in the late Government, on the 21st June last, to have been, after long consideration, suggested by the Treasury, were proceeded with, and any Treasury Minute made thereon, as promised by him; and, if not, whether the present Government has been able yet to take up the matter; whether he is able now to state when the Report of the Departmental Committee, as to the Civil Service Writers, may be expected; and, whether the Government propose to make or recommend any inquiry into the Civil Service generally?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): In answer to the first part of this Question, I have to say that no such Treasury Minute has yet been made; but the matter is at present under consideration. With regard to the second part, I have previously answered that I hope to have a Report from the Committee in a short time. As to the third point, I stated, in answer to the hon. Member for Otley (Mr. Barran), that I could safely promise that a statement would be made upon this matter before the close of the present Session.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT BELFAST — LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT BY CATHOLIC WORKPEOPLE.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What report is made by the Constabulary authorities in Belfast as to the extent to which Catholic workpeople in that town, who lost their employment during the recent riots, have now been restored to it; and, what measures have been adopted by the employers to keep order in their establishments?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked whether the Constabulary Report referred to the number of Protestants who also had to leave their employment during the periods covered by the late riots in Belfast?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have no information on the subject of the Protestant workmen, and generally speaking it is impossible for me to give the hon. Gentleman any definite reply upon a matter which is really not under the power of the authorities at all. So far as we are aware—for the matter is not within the official knowledge of the police—in most instances where Catholic workers left their employment during the recent disturbances they have now returned, and things are going on as before the riots. It there are any exceptions to this rule it may confidently be hoped that they will not continue long. I understand that the employers in most of the establishments discharge or threaten with dismissal any persons in their employment who interfere with their fellow-workers.

MR. SEXTON asked if that applied to the case of the Mayor of Belfast?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I cannot answer that.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE FORCE IN BELFAST.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What measures have been resolved upon for the increase and redistribution of the Constabulary force in Belfast; and, who is to command the force?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): An extra Constabulary force of 400 men remains for the present at Belfast in aid of the local force. A portion will be concentrated as a reserve in a central part of the town. The remainder will be allocated to the several Constabulary barracks. Six houses have been taken by the Government for additional barracks in different localities. The force is under the command of Mr. Cullen, Assistant Inspector General, and D.M.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked if it was intended to submit a Supplementary Estimate for the six houses?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No; the houses are taken at a rent as additional barracks.

MR. SEXTON asked whether, in view of the fact that during the riots attacks had been made on the navvies returning from work at the Alexandra Dock by the Island men, the right hon. Gentleman would consider the suggestion he (Mr. Sexton) made some time ago to the effect that a permanent police station should be placed in that quarter of the town?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: That will have to be considered in connection with the permanent arrangements that will have to be made. The arrangements I have mentioned are, of course, only temporary.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—EXPENSES OF THE ROYAL HOSPITAL.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Lord Lieutenant has considered a Memorial addressed to His Excellency on the 24th ult. by the Governing Body of the Belfast Royal Hospital, representing that the hospital is entirely supported by voluntary contributions; that no Government grant has ever been made to it; that it relieves the suffering without regard to religion or party; that during the recent riots 369 patients, suffering from gunshot and other wounds and injuries, were received and carefully attended to at a cost to the hospital of £800; that the deficit upon the present year amounts to £1,100; and that the straitened condition of trade allows of no hope that the extra expenditure can be met by additional voluntary contributions; and, whether, as prayed in the Memorial, a Supplementary Estimate will be submitted to the House for a Grant in aid of the Belfast Royal Hospital?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, the Government received and carefully considered the Memorial mentioned by the hon. Member. While, however, they gladly recognized the benefit and assistance derived from the Belfast Royal Hospital, they did not feel themselves in a position to give a favourable reply to the appeal for aid. To do so would not be in accordance with the precedents relating to hospitals generally in the United Kingdom. The only place in which grants of this kind had been made to hospitals was Dublin, and it did not seem at all desirable to extend that principle.

MR. SEXTON gave Notice that on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply on the Civil Service Estimates he would move that a Supplementary Estimate should be presented as a Vote in aid of the Belfast Royal Hospital.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) asked if the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that four or five years ago £1,500 was granted for the purpose of paying the expenses of a doctor who attended a landlord who had been severely injured, and whether the persons that were injured in Belfast were not just as much victims as the landlords were?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Payments to hospitals and payments to doctors are not the same thing.

ARMY QUARTERMASTERS.

COLONEL FRANCIS DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any improvement is contemplated in the position of Army Quartermasters?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): The Report of the Committee appointed by my Predecessor to consider this question has been received, and I hope to communicate a decision on an early date.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — KILDYSART GUARDIANS, CO. CLARE.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If, at the meeting of the Board of Guardians at Kildysart, county Clare, last week, six eviction notices were read at the suit of Captain Hector Vandeleur, Colonel White, and Mr. O'Dea; and, if, after lengthened discussion, a resolution was unanimously adopted, condemnatory of evictions as inimical to the interests of the landlords as well as of the tenants?

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid) asked, if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the appointment of General Buller had the effect of stimulating eviction proceedings in the county Clare?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that was not at all within his knowledge. The facts were as stated in the Question of the hon. Member for West Clare.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CONVICTION AT MILLSTREET PETTY SESSIONS.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid), who had the following Question on the Paper:—To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that, at the Millstreet Petty Sessions, held on Monday, the 23rd of August, two boys named John Kiely and Cornelius Coweniham, were charged and convicted with having wilfully and maliciously broken the windows of the Protestant Church at Liscahane, near Millstreet; at what o'clock was the outrage said to have been committed; whether the fathers of the above-mentioned youths are labourers in the employment of Jeremiah Hegarty; whether Jeremiah Hegarty is the local agent and factotum of the Landlord Defence Association and the Irish Loyal Protestant Union; and, whether Her Majesty's Government purpose making any further investigations into the causation of the outrage, whether committed by the boys out of pure wantonness, or whether promoted by other parties? said, he wished to correct the last part of the Question by substituting for "other parties" the "Irish Loyal Defence Union."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University), in reply, said, the two boys referred to were charged and convicted in the manner stated in the Question of the hon. Member. The offence was committed at half-past 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the 15th of August. There was, as far as he could learn, no association in Ireland bearing the name mentioned in the Question. There was nothing that he knew of in the case to call for further investigation.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—ARMY AND NAVY GUNS.

MR. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to an article in *The Weekly Dispatch* of Sept. 5th, in which it is stated that:—

> "As a matter of fact, while the money disappears year after year with the utmost regularity, our Army and Navy remain to this day without a single efficient and serviceable gun between them;"

and, whether, so far as regards the Army, this statement is true, or approximately true?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am happy to say the statement is neither true, nor approximately true.

ASYLUMS FOR THE POOR (IRELAND)—MONAGHAN ASYLUM.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the architect to the Commissioners of Asylums for the Poor in Ireland, after his inspection of the Asylum at Monaghan in 1883, recommended to the Board of that Institution several important alterations in the construction of the buildings as necessary for the safety and comfort of the inmates; whether the recommendations of the official in question included the carrying of the several dividing walls of the different departments, which at present terminate at the ceilings, over the roofs, and the reconstruction of some of the ceilings, which are cracked and in danger of falling; whether the carrying of dividing walls over the roof is always insisted on by architects in similar and other public Institutions under Government control in England, as a precaution against the spread of fire; whether the Board of the Monaghan Asylum sanctioned the recommendations referred to, and received tenders for the execution of the works; and, whether they have yet carried out the alterations referred to; and, if not, whether he will explain why, and say whether he will cause them to be proceeded with without further delay?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he thought there must be some mistake in this matter. The Commissioners stated there was no record in their office of any such Report as that referred to in the Question. However, they would make further inquiries about it; and if they found that the works suggested were considered necessary, steps would be taken to have them carried out.

ARMY (INDIA) — MEDICAL SERVICE— HONORARY COMMISSIONS.

MR. LAWSON (St. Pancras, W.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he is aware that under Government Resolution, No. 190, dated Bombay, January 12th, 1881, it was ruled that no more medical subordinates would be promoted to honorary commissions unless they had obtained medical diplomas; that three warrant medical officers came to England under this rule, and, after much study and expense, obtained English medical diplomas; and that, on their return to India, the rule was abrogated by Indian Army Circular, Clause 83, paragraph 4, dated July 1884, by the decision that no further promotions would be made to the rank of honorary surgeon; and, whether, considering the circumstances under which they acted, he will take steps to secure their promotion to the honorary commissioned rank under the rule of January 12th 1881?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): Prior to July, 1884, a diploma was, as stated in the Question, one, but only one, of the several qualifications requisite for selection for the rank of honorary surgeon. At that date, on a re-organization of the subordinate medical establishment, the selection of warrant officers for the post of honorary surgeon was put an end to on public grounds; but, instead, certain other privileges were conferred on the Department to which the warrant officers belonged. There is, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, no reason for making an exception in the case of the three officers referred to.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — SERGEANT INSTRUCTORS TO VOLUNTEER CORPS.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the reason for the distinction in the rank of the senior non-commissioned officers in battalions of the Regular Army, the Militia, and the Volunteers; and, if, having regard to the great and continuous responsibility devolving upon those deserving soldiers who are attached as Sergeant Instructors to Volunteer Corps, the senior of them could be accorded either warrant rank or substantive rank, as in the Standing Army and Militia?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The reason for the distinction is that the duties required of the senior non-commissioned officers of the permanent staff of Volunteer Corps are less than those required in the Regular Army and Militia. I must refer the hon. and gallant Member to the answer given by my Predecessor on March 19 last, in which he fully explained the case. I see no grounds for re-opening the question.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) — ARRANGEMENTS IN COUNTY MEATH.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the correspondence between Grangegeith and Slane, county Meath, has increased threefold since the 16th August; whether this increase is due to the fact that the people there have appointed a postman, at their own expense, who carries their letters since that date; and, whether, owing to this increase, he will have a post office established at Grangegeith forthwith?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In answer to the hon. Member I have to state that the increase since the 16th August last in the number of letters between the villages of Slane and Grangegeith, which are 3½ miles apart, has been so rapid and remarkable that I have caused special inquiry to be made, in order to ascertain what may account for this sudden growth. When the Returns were taken in July there were only 34 letters a week, and now the number has more than doubled, a most unusual occurrence. It will be necessary to see whether such an unprecedented growth as nearly 200 per cent in three weeks is likely to be maintained before considering the matter further. At present the inhabitants send a private messenger to Slane daily for letters.

FRANCHISE (IRELAND) ACT — REMUNERATION TO CLERKS OF UNIONS, &c.—KINSALE.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a Resolution recently passed by the Kinsale Board of Guardians, requesting Parliament to vote a sum in remuneration of clerks of unions and rate collectors for services under the Franchise Act; and, whether the Government will make some provision this year for the claims of these officials to such remuneration?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he had to thank the hon. Member for having sent him a copy of the resolution referred to in the Question; and a copy of a similar resolution, he believed, had also been received by the Local Government Board. He had already answered more than one Question on this subject; and he was afraid that he was unable to give any additional information.

MR. HOOPER: Are we to understand, then, that this is the last word the Government will say on the question, either now or in the future?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: That will depend upon whether any more Questions are asked.

MR. HOOPER: I wished to know whether it is intended next year to take this question into consideration?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have already explained that a special grant was made in this matter last year on account of the special circumstances of that year's registration. If any reason is shown to the Government to take up the question again, of course that will be considered next year.

A MINISTER OF EDUCATION—REPORT OF COMMONS COMMITTEE, 1884.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to take any action on the Report of the House of Commons Committee of 1884, which unanimously recommended the appointment of a Minister of Education?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I cannot say that the matter alluded to in the Question of the hon. Member has yet come under the notice of the Government, nor can I hold out any hope that it is likely to come very soon under our notice. Speaking as Chancellor of the Exchequer, I will not conceal from the hon. Member that I have a strong suspicion that the proposal which he appears to advocate would involve an increased charge upon the public revenues; and every alteration, or reform, or modification of a Department which would involve an increased charge possesses in my eyes an incurable defect.

NAVY—PAY OF SEAMEN—LOSS THROUGH DEPRECIATION OF SILVER.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If the gain or loss to the State arising from the difference between the local rate of exchange and the rate at which the crews of Her Majesty's ships are paid, when a silver currency is used, is shown in any statement presented to Parliament; and, if it is not, whether it can be shown in future?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): The present arrangement with regard to the issue of dollars and rupees is that the rate is fixed annually on the average price of standard silver in the London Market during the previous year. This system was arranged between the Treasury and the Departments concerned some years ago. It is very difficult to form any idea as to the results to the State of these fluctuations in the rate of exchange. I have, however, looked at the profit and loss account of the Hong Kong Treasury Chest, and I find that on the 10 years ending March 31, 1885, this account shows a dead loss of more than £11,000, arising from Naval, Military, and Civil Services taken together. The total gain or loss to the State arising from payments it has to make to soldiers, sailors, and civilians outside the United Kingdom is shown in the annual Treasury Chest account under the head of profit and loss. The result of the 10 years ending March 31, 1885, was a net profit of somewhat over £8,000, which has been paid into the Exchequer. The profit and loss accounts at the different stations are not published separately.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—ACTION OF THE POLICE AT WOODFORD, CO. GALWAY.

Mr. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether certain placards, calling on the people in the neighbourhood of Woodford to come and save the harvest belonging to the evicted tenants and others who were arrested during the recent evictions, were torn down by the police; what authority the police had for so doing; and, will they be prevented from doing so in the future?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): The placards referred to were removed by the police on the grounds, as the District Inspector reports, that, owing to the lawless demeanour displayed by the people at Woodford at the recent evictions in that neighbourhood and the excitement still prevailing, the police considered the placards of a highly inflammatory nature. Having seen and read one of them, I am of opinion that, not merely were they highly inflammatory, but that they had a direct tendency to lead to a breach of the public peace, and that the police were perfectly justified in their action.

Mr. SHEEHY asked, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman would read the inflammatory language to the House?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ALLEGED ASSAULT ON DR. D'ALTON, OF BRANMORE.

Mr. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Dr. D'Alton, of Branmore, was assaulted on Sunday 30th ultimo, by Constable Rooney; whether the police prosecuted Dr. D'Alton; whether the Bench dismissed the case against Dr. D'Alton, the presiding magistrate remarking that the police seemed to have a "set" on Dr. D'Alton; whether Dr. D'Alton is still under medical treatment, and in very serious danger; and, what action has been taken by the authorities to bring Rooney to justice?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): There is a mistake as to dates, and there is some confusion as to facts, in the Question of the hon. Member. The police took proceedings against Dr. D'Alton to compel him to find sureties to keep the peace and to recover two penalties for drunkenness on the 4th of August last. The former of these proceedings was dismissed on technical grounds, and one of the latter was dismissed without prejudice and the other adjourned for a fortnight on the application of the defendant; and Mr. Lyster, the Resident Magistrate, stated on that occasion that there seemed to be a set on Dr. D'Alton. This observation appears, however, only to refer to the adjourned case of drunkenness, which seemed to the Magistrate to be trivial in its character. The first part of the Question probably refers to a transaction that occurred on the 28th of August, which is to be investigated at Petty Sessions on the 15th instant, and pending these proceedings it would be inexpedient to make any statement on the subject.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—UNEXPENDED GRANTS.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, What further sums are available for the construction of piers and harbours in Ireland under the Act 46 and 47 Vic. c. 26, from the following sources—namely, the unexpended balance out of the £20,000 allocated by the Board of Public Works for expenses; the difference between the estimated cost of the harbour works undertaken, and the actual sum expended thereon; and the interest on the balances remaining in the hands of the Treasury out of the £250,000 voted by Parliament for piers and harbours, which interest a former Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury, the honourable Member for the Bodmin Division of Cornwall, promised would be added to the Piers and Harbours Fund?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I am afraid it is impossible to give any very definite reply to this Question.

The £250,000 may be divided into three portions. First, £20,000 reserved for expenses; out of this some £5,000 or £6,000 may be expected to be saved. Secondly, £203,000 allotted as free grants; looking to the uncertainty which always attaches to sea works it would not be safe to count on any saving here. Thirdly, £27,000 granted on loan; this amount will be available hereafter when the loans have been repaid. As regards allowing interest on the undrawn balance of the fund, I do not find that any distinct promise was given; but in any case, as the hon. Member knows, legislation would be necessary.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—POSTAL FACILITIES AT KINSALE.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called to a memorial from the Town and Harbour Commissioners of Kinsale, dated 17th November 1885, calling attention to the necessity for increased postal facilities for their town; and, whether he will take steps to meet the postal wants of a town which constitutes so important a military and fishing station?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The Department has for a long time been in negotiation with the Cork and Bandon Railway Company for certain improvements on the lines of that Company; but I fear it will not be practicable to obtain the trains on the Kinsale branch which would be necessary to give effect to the wishes expressed by the Town and Harbour Commissioners. I will, however, see whether the local arrangements cannot be somewhat improved, so that a delivery of the letters may take place more quickly after the arrival of the letter bags.

CUSTOMS ESTIMATES—SURVEYOR OF THE PORT OF LONDON.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the fact that, although the Customs Estimates include an item for the Salaries of sixty-nine Surveyors for the Port of London, the number actually employed since the 1st day of January has not exceeded sixty-two; and, whether it is the intention of the Board of Customs to fill up the existing vacancies?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The number of Customs Surveyors for the Port of London was 69, and salaries for that number were included in the Estimates. But early in this year the Customs Commissioners instituted an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether a lesser number of Surveyors would not suffice for the duties to be performed. The Report of that inquiry was received in March last, and the result of it would be that the number of Surveyors would be reduced to 60, at which number they now actually stood. While the inquiry was taking place it was not thought prudent or possible to reduce the number of Surveyors. Of course, the saving to the Exchequer would be the difference between 69 and 60 Surveyors, and an account would be rendered to the Exchequer in due course.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, whether the Customs Vote would be reduced in consequence?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I own that at first I was inclined to ask the hon. Member to move the reduction of the Vote, to which I should have assented; but I think, on the whole, the explanation of the Commissioners is a satisfactory one, and as there will be no loss to the Exchequer I will ask the hon. Member to be satisfied with the explanation I have given.

INSPECTORS UNDER THE EXPLOSIVES ACT—THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will consider the advisability of having the duties of Inspectors under the Explosives Act performed in future by the Royal Irish Constabulary, instead of by persons paid out of the Rates for the Relief of the Poor, and whose appointments are made and salaries fixed by the Magistrates at Petty Sessions?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): This is a matter which it is within the power of the Local Authorities to deal with. They can, if they see fit, appoint members of the Constabulary to act as Inspectors under the Explosives Act, and thus relieve the rates.

An hon. MEMBER asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the Boards of Guardians had made repeated representations to the Local Government Board in reference to this matter, and that those representations were unattended to. The magistrates comprised the Local Authorities, and the Boards of Guardians appeared to have no authority in the matter whatever?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the Government had done all they could in the matter. Some time ago a Circular was issued to the Local Authorities, pointing out that they had power to appoint members of the Royal Irish Constabulary as Inspectors. Inquiry would be made as to how far the recommendations had been carried out.

EGYPT—THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS AT ASSOUAN.

MR. R. G. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that the British Troops quartered at Assouan are in mud huts, on the site of an Arab graveyard, in the midst of a district where dust storms are prevalent; whether there is any knowledge of the average temperature in these huts during the day in the summer months; whether the water used by the Troops for drinking purposes is so thick with mud that it has to be partially clarified by the use of alum; if any filters have been supplied for the use of the Force at Assouan; what is the number of Troops stationed at Assouan, and the proportion of them who were, by last returns, suffering from enteric fever, dysentery, and heat apoplexy; for how long has any portion of this Force been there continuously; and, when is it proposed to relieve these Troops?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The troops at Assouan are quartered in huts with mud walls, which is probably the best material of which huts could be composed, on a hill to the south-west of Assouan. There is an old Mahomedan cemetery at a considerable distance from the lines. The temperature between April and June has ranged from 100 degrees F. to 122 degrees F. in the huts. All Nile water is, I am informed, impure from suspended matter which is got rid of by the use of alum and strainers. The troops have filters, and, as far as practicable, the water for drinking purposes is boiled before being used. The number of troops at Assouan on August 20 was 1,690, and nine cases of enteric fever and five of dysentery remained in hospital on that date. I am unable to say how long any portion of this force has been there continuously. The disposition of the troops in Egypt rests with the General Officer commanding. It is understood that he proposes to relieve shortly those troops that have been at Assouan during the summer by fresh troops from Cairo.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—DEFICIENT ARRANGEMENTS AT WEST HAM.

MR. FORREST FULTON (West Ham, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been drawn to the inadequate telegraph accommodation in the Upton Park district of the borough of West Ham; and, whether, pursuant to the petition forwarded to the Post Office by the inhabitants on the 25th of June last, he will provide additional facilities?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member I have the pleasure to say that instructions were given some days ago for the telegraph to be extended to Upton Park in accordance with the wishes of the Memorialists.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE—SUMMER CLOTHING.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can see his way to any alteration in the summer clothing and helmets of the Metropolitan Police Force, so as to make that outfit more suitable than it is at present for warm weather?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): The question of any alteration in the summer clothing of the Metropolitan Police has not been brought under my consideration; but I am informed that the Chief Commissioner is in favour of the present system of clothing, thinking that in our variable climate there is more danger from wet and cold than from excessive heat. However, any suggestion that the Police Authorities may have to make will receive my best attention.

METROPOLIS (MAIN DRAINAGE OUTFALLS)—POLLUTION OF THE RIVER THAMES.

MR. W. F. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What steps the Metropolitan Board of Works are taking to remedy the nuisance arising from the pollution of the River Thames by the main drainage outfalls?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): In answer to my hon. Friend I have to say that it would be impossible for me in an answer to detail the plans and scientific processes by which the Metropolitan Board have expressed their intention of disposing of the sewage without nuisance to the Thames. If the hon. Member will call on me at the Home Office I will show them to him—they are very voluminous. The views of the Home Office were communicated to the Board in May last; but the Board did not entirely accept those views, but said that they were fully persuaded that the measures which they did propose to adopt would be found sufficient for the prevention of any pollution of the river water by the London sewage, and the Board have since informed me that designs for permanent works for the treatment of the sewage at Barking Creek have been prepared and are being printed with a view to obtain tenders for the execution of the necessary works.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHEMES OF THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS.

MR. F. S. POWELL (Wigan) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether he will present to the House, at the commencement of next Session, a Return of the schemes submitted to the Education Department by the Charity Commissioners, and not dealt with by that Department before the 1st of January 1886, and of the schemes submitted to that Department by the Charity Commissioners under the said Acts during the year 1886, and subsequently up to the date of the Return, the Return to give the dates at which each scheme was sent to, approved by the Department or otherwise dealt with, and the date of Her Majesty's approbation (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 135, of Session 1886)?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): There will be no objection on the part of the Education Department to make such a Return at the commencement of next Session if the hon. Member will then move for it.

ARMY (CLOTHING DEPARTMENT)—ARMY CLOTHING FACTORY, PIMLICO.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN COMMERELL (Southampton) asked the Secretary of State for War, If he has any objection to allow a tunic manufactured at Limerick, and another at the Clothing Establishment, Pimlico, with their prices attached, to be left, for the convenience of inspection by Members, in one of the Committee Rooms; and, whether, taking into consideration the distress in the Metropolis last winter, and its possible recurrence, he will allow the Clothing Establishment at Pimlico to remain at its full strength?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): I do not think a Committee Room of the House is a suitable place for exhibiting tunics; but any Member wishing to inspect garments will receive every attention from the Director of Clothing at the Royal Army Clothing Factory, where he will be able to see tunics manufactured at both establishments. The strength of the clothing establishment must vary according to the requirements of the Service, the increase or decrease of the number of *employés* being regulated by the amount of work to be done.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.) asked, whether, in view of the fact that the manufacture of Army clothing in the Pimlico Factory entailed the loss of several thousand pounds a year to the country, the hon. Gentleman would consider the desirability of limiting the production of that extensive factory?

MR. NORTHCOTE said, he was afraid he could not answer the Question of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick, because he was not able to accept the premisses that the extravagance was as general as was represented by the hon. Gentleman.

CHINA AND BURMAH—TRADE IN OPIUM.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in the agreement with China in reference to Burmah, trade in opium between Burmah and China is mutually prohibited?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The agreement contains no stipulation in regard to opium.

ADMIRALTY — STATE OF EUROPE — REDUCTION OF THE DOCKYARD ESTABLISHMENTS.

SIR SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, in view of the disturbed state of Europe, the Government will reconsider the question of reducing the establishment in Her Majesty's Dockyards by the proposed dismissal of some hundreds of excellent workmen, many of them of long service, and, if possible, find them continued employment at useful work, which will increase the efficiency of our Naval defences?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): No orders have been given for any large discharges of workmen from the Dockyards; but the number of men employed in the Yards must be arranged in accordance with the amount of work to be executed and the money which has been voted. I am anxious to expedite the completion of the work now going on in our Dockyards, and to obtain a rapid and economical output; but I am satisfied this can better be done by improved methods of administration than by redundant establishments.

DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—SALARY OF OFFICIALS.

MR. BARRY (Wexford, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been drawn to resolutions passed by a majority of the Boards of Governors of District Asylums in Ireland, in favour of the claims of the asylum officials and attendants for an increase of salary and superannuation allowance; and, whether the Government intend to take any steps in the matter this year?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he was informed that a large number of resolutions had been received in reference to this matter. He had not yet had time to give much attention to them. He was not aware of any sufficient reason for taking the steps suggested in the Question with reference to the salaries of officials employed in lunatic asylums in Ireland. Individual cases brought before the Government by the Boards of Governors would be, however, duly considered. Cases of superannuation follow the Civil Service Rules.

THE POSTAL UNION—PAYMENT IN FRENCH CURRENCY.

MR. SAMUEL MONTAGU (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) asked the Postmaster General, If his attention has been called to the fact that, under existing postal arrangements, most Continental letters are carried at a less cost than is the case with letters posted from this country; whether he is aware that a letter from Russia is carried to any place within the Postal Union for seven kopecks, or less than 1¾*d.*, and from Austria for ten kreutzers, or less than 2*d.*, as against 2½*d.* if posted from the United Kingdom; whether any compensation is obtained in settling accounts; and, whether steps will be taken to obtain for this Country a more favourable arrangement?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The postage to and from countries which, like Great Britain, Russia, and Austria, belong to the Postal Union is fixed by the International Convention in French currency. The single letter rate is 25 centimes; but the Convention allows of fractional variations, upwards or downwards, to meet the case of countries which have not the franc for their monetary unit. The equivalent of 25 centimes in British currency is a fraction under 2½*d.*, which is recognized by the Treaty as the English equivalent. The sums of seven kopecks and 10 kreutzer are the sums admitted under Treaty as the Russian and Austrian equivalents for 25 centimes. As, under the Postal Union system, every country keeps the whole postage collected by it, the question of compensation in settling accounts does not arise. The present arrangements, laid down by the Postal Congress, work on the whole satisfactorily, and it is not proposed to alter them.

INDIA (MADRAS)—THE LAND UNION IN TANJORE—LAND TAX IN MADRAS.

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether mass meetings of landholders in the Madras Presidency have recently been held to protest against the action of the Government of Madras in demanding as arrears of land tax several lacs of rupees remitted in regular course by the Tanjore district authorities; whether the Madras Government has made these demands on the confidential report of their special Commissioner, Mr. H. S. Thomas, representing that remissions had been made owing to misrepresentations by district officials; whether numerous officials have, in consequence of this report, been dismissed the service without trial, and otherwise punished; whether the landlords have publicly challenged the accuracy of the secret report of Mr. Thomas; whether, since the present senior member of the Madras Board of Revenue, the present Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, and the present Revenue Secretary to the Madras Government, have each in succession been of late years Principal Collector at Tanjore, and responsible for the district administration, he will explain how such wholesale corruption, as alleged by Mr. Thomas, could have existed; and, whether he will order further inquiry to be made?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): In March, 1885, the collector of Tanjore reported to the Madras Government that owing to heavy rains and floods in October, November, and December, 1884, it would be necessary to remit land revenue to the extent of nearly seven lakhs of rupees. Before sanctioning the proposed remission the Madras Government sent Mr. Thomas, senior member of the Board of Revenue, to make a personal inquiry. His Report left no doubt that there was a widespread conspiracy among the officials of the district to defraud the Government, and that little more than half the remission proposed could justly be claimed. Numerous officials, whose conduct had been personally inquired into by Mr. Thomas, were dismissed or otherwise punished; and such remissions of land revenue as were recommended by him were alone sanctioned. The action of the Madras Government has been approved by the Secretary of State in Council. Her Majesty's Government have no information of the holding of mass meetings by the landowners, and of their having challenged the accuracy of Mr. Thomas's Report. The three officials, of whom Mr. Thomas is the first, alluded to in the fifth paragraph of the Question, ceased to be collectors of Tanjore in the years 1878, 1881, and 1883, respectively. The frauds reported by Mr. Thomas took place at the end of 1884 and beginning of 1885, and could not, therefore, have been discovered by them. The matter requires, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, very careful inquiry, which has already been ordered.

ARMY (AMMUNITION)—CARTRIDGES.

MR. EDWIN DE LISLE (Leicestershire, Mid) asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can state what quantity of solid-drawn cartridges there are in store; and, whether there is not fear that, in case of war, it would be necessary largely to make use of the Boxer Cartridges which have been manufactured since they were condemned on account of failure in the Soudan War?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): On public grounds I entertain a strong objection to giving the information asked for; but I can assure the hon. Member that there is no fear of the supply of solid-drawn cartridges being deficient in case of war.

MR. DE LISLE inquired whether it was a fact that the Boxer cartridges had been manufactured in large quantities since they had been condemned?

MR. W. H. SMITH said, it was a fact that those cartridges had been manufactured, and issued, for practice purposes, to Volunteer corps.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CULDAFF PIER.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to Culdaff Pier, If he will state upon what information he stated that the Piers and Harbours Commissioners had approved of the plan of the

Board of Works; and, whether he would ascertain what the opinion of the Inspectors of Fisheries is as to the extension of the pier?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the hon. Member was under some misapprehension with regard to this matter; but if he would refer him further to the points complained of he would inquire into them.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR intimated that he would ask a further Question of the Secretary to the Treasury on the same subject.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—INTERMEDIATE AND HIGHER EDUCATION (WALES).

MR. THOMAS ELLIS (Merionethshire) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been drawn to the statement in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Intermediate and Higher Education in Wales, that,

> "according to calculations made after the Census of 1871, out of a population of 1,426,514 in Wales and Monmouthshire, no less than 1,006,100 habitually speak Welsh;"

and, whether, in view of the distinctive national characteristics of Wales, he is willing to reconsider his decision not to publish a separate annual Report on Elementary Education in Wales, in a form and at a price which would make it available to those connected with and interested in the progress of Welsh Education?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): I am aware of the statement referred to in the first part of the Question. The point raised shall receive consideration; but for the reasons given in my reply on the 6th instant, I am not at present prepared to disturb the arrangement deliberately made by the right hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), which has only been in force two years, and has been found to work satisfactorily. The hon. Member will observe that the general Report for 1886-7 will, as a matter of course, contain a Report on Wales, and I will arrange to have a number of copies issued separately in a form that shall be more generally accessible to those interested in Welsh education.

BULGARIA—ABDICATION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, To state, as far as he can do so without detriment to the public service, the latest information received in regard to the position of Prince Alexander in Bulgaria, and the nature of any communications that have passed between the Great Powers as to the future of Bulgaria, as well as the position which has been taken up by Her Majesty's Government on that subject?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The position of Prince Alexander is that he has abdicated his Throne, and the proceedings prescribed by the Treaty of Berlin with reference to the election of a Prince of Bulgaria will naturally follow. They are—a free Election by the Assembly, the confirmation by the Sublime Porte, and the assent of the Treaty Powers. While the action following upon the late events in Bulgaria is in so early a stage, I believe that the House will approve of my excusing myself from entering upon the communications between the Great Powers. Such a course at the present time could hardly fail to embarrass Her Majesty's Government, and to diminish its beneficial influence. I am permitted, however, to say that Her Majesty's Government have no reason to believe that the action of any of the Powers will be inconsistent with their Treaty engagements.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT—THE DONAGHMORE UNION SCHEMES.

MR. WILLIAM MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossory) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Board of Guardians of the Donaghmore Union, before its dissolution, adopted thirteen schemes under the Labourers Act; and, what the Government propose to do, in order that the proceedings already completed may not prove abortive?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Donaghmore Guardians adopted the 13 schemes under the Labourers Act at the beginning of last April; but they do not appear to have exerted themselves to proceed with them promptly, so that they might have been concluded before the dissolution of the Board, as the petitions of the Sanitary Authority and the necessary accompanying documents were not lodged with the Local Government Board until the 21st of August. The Local Government Board are taking the opinion of their legal adviser as to the best course to pursue under the circumstances.

NAVY—EDUCATION OF JUNIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICERS—ADMIRAL LUARD'S COMMITTEE.

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will lay upon the Table the Report of Admiral Luard's Committee on the "Education of the Junior Executive Officers of the Navy;" and, whether a certain number of copies can be supplied for the use of Members who may desire to possess the same?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Yes, Sir; copies of the Report will be laid on the Table.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—DISCOVERIES OF GOLD.

MR. SALT (Stafford) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he can afford any authentic information respecting the character and probable extent of the recent discoveries of gold in Australia?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My hon. Friend is referring, no doubt, to the gold field discovered in Western Australia. The Governor has proclaimed the district between 126 degrees and 129 degrees east and 16 degrees and 19·30 degrees south as a gold district, and an Act has been passed for its management similar to the Queensland Act. According to our latest information (May 21), the Kimberley gold field, as it is called, continues to make progress. More than 1,000 ounces of gold have come down to Derby or Cambridge Gulf. The number of miners at present on the field is 600 or 700. The rapidity of the rush is checked by the fact that the gold field must be approached by a difficult tropical land journey of over 300 miles, and that the miners must be provided with horses and stores, and must, therefore, be men of some capital.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS IN CAMP.

COLONEL EYRE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in come Volunteer Corps, non-commissioned officers and privates are paid when in camp; whether the capitation grant is applicable to such purposes; and, whether some steps will be taken to put a stop to this practice if it is not in accordance with the Volunteer Regulation?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The Returns show, as far as they have been examined, that in some Volunteer corps the men receive pay when in camp. It was not the intention that the capitation grant should be applied to this Service, and it does not follow that it is, as the corps which adopt the practice show generally an expenditure in excess of the grant. There is no regulation to prevent officers supplementing the capitation grant out of their own pockets or by subscriptions. I may add that a special allowance is granted to cover the general expense which Volunteer corps are necessarily subject to in the formation of camps.

LIABILITIES OF TRUSTEES—INDIAN GUARANTEED RAILWAY SHARES.

MR. PULESTON (Devonport) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Government would support a Bill extending the authority of trustees to invest in Indian Guaranteed Railway Shares?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham) said, the Question should be addressed to the Attorney General.

RAILWAYS—SAFETY RAILWAY COUPLINGS.

MR. COCHRANE-BAILLIE (St. Pancras, N.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether any notice has been taken by the Government of the competition for the improvement of safety Railway couplings, held at Nine Elms goods yard in the spring of this year; and, whether they will cause any inquiry to be made into the results that were obtained?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Some of the Inspecting Officers attended the competition referred to by the hon. Member; but the Board of Trade have expressed no opinion upon the results, not wishing to assume a responsibility which must necessarily rest upon those who have the control and management of railways. The result of the competition can, no doubt, be obtained from the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.

INDIA—TRANSFER OF THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT TO SIMLA.

MR. JAMES MACLEAN (Oldham) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether Her Majesty's Government has received any representations from the Government of India with reference to the proposed transfer of the seat of Government from Calcutta to Simla, and whether any statement can be made to allay the apprehension created in India by the rumour that the Finance Commission is about to recommend fixing upon Simla as the seat of Government; whether Parliament will be consulted before any definite decision is come to on this matter; and, whether, in case of the transfer of Government to a salubrious spot in the hills, when the unhealthiness and discomfort of life is no greater than in any British town, he will take care that the salaries of the entire official staff becoming resident at Simla shall be reduced and assimilated to that of English officials, for the benefit of the Indian taxpayer?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): No proposal has been made by the Government of India to transfer the seat of Government from Calcutta to Simla. I hope this statement will allay the apprehension in India referred to in the Question. Should such a proposal as that of changing the seat of Government in India be ever made, I have no doubt that Parliament would have ample opportunities of expressing its opinion before any definite decisiou was come to. The Secretary of State will defer the consideration of the necessity of a revision of official salaries until some necessity giving rise to such necessity has arisen.

FRANCE—ARREST OF MR. FARREN, A BRITISH SUBJECT.

MR. KENYON (Denbigh, &c.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any intelligence has been received at the Foreign Office relative to the alleged arrest of Mr. George Farren, J.P., of Carnarvon, and his party, on board the yacht *Lady Bessie*, by the French authorities, off the coast of Brittany?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The Foreign Office have received no information or complaint upon the subject referred to.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE WOODFORD PRISONERS (GALWAY).

MR. SHEEHY (Galway, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether he is aware that substantial bail has been offered on behalf of the Woodford prisoners; and, whether, having regard to the present peaceable condition of the district, he will instruct the Crown Solicitor of Galway to take bail for the appearance of the prisoners at trial?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): It is the Court of Petty Sessions or the Supreme Court, not the Crown Solicitor, that makes an order allowing a prisoner to be discharged on bail; but it is usual, when such an application is made, for the Crown Solicitor to consent or to oppose. The charge against the Woodford prisoners is a very serious one; and the Crown, I fear, will be obliged to oppose any application on the part of the prisoners for bail.

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD—REPRESENTATION.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to a Resolution, unanimously adopted at a recent Conference of Guardians, that—

> "The Metropolitan Unions are inadequately represented on the Asylums Board, and that fuller and more satisfactory accounts should be published by the Board of its receipts and payments;"

and, whether he proposes to take any steps to give effect to this Resolution?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): With regard to the representation of the Metropolitan Union on the Asylums Board, an order was issued last week increasing the number of elected managers by nine. Information as to the expenditure of the Asylums Board is already furnished by the managers to the Guardians; and, prior to each half-yearly audit, the ledger accounts of the managers are open to the inspection of any ratepayer or owner of property in the Metropolis. If any suggestion specifying precisely what additional accounts are desired is submitted to me on behalf of the Conference alluded to, it will receive my consideration.

METROPOLIS — THE POOR RATEPAYERS OF LONDON.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, seeing that he has promised a day for the consideration of a Bill to relieve the poor tenantry of Ireland, he will also give his favourable consideration, during the present Session of Parliament, to the Bill which has been introduced to relieve the poor ratepayers of London?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I am very much interested and greatly impressed by the close analogy which the hon. Member draws between the condition of the tenantry of Ireland and the condition of the poor ratepayers of London; and I have no doubt that the analogy will afford a very valuable argument in the debate on the Land Bill when it comes on. But, having admitted this, I see no occasion to depart from the position taken up by the Government, either to initiate themselves, or to encourage on the part of private Members, legislation during the present Session.

ARMY—ORDNANCE COMMITTEE—CALCULATED BURSTING STRAIN OF GUNS.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will refer to the Ordnance Committee with Special Associate Members, the following Questions:—What was the calculated bursting strain; what was the actual calculated strain under the charge with which the gun burst, in tons per square inch, for each of the guns that burst on board H.M.S. *Active*, *Thunderer*, and *Collingwood;* whether "jamming" of the shot, in consequence of the increasing twist of the rifling, be sufficient to account for the bursting of each of these guns; and, whether he will report the answers to these questions to the House?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I will take care that the information which he is desirous of obtaining shall be furnished to the hon. Member.

NAVY—NAVAL SCHOOLMASTERS' PENSIONS.

SIR SAMUEL WILSON (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will grant to Naval Schoolmasters, on completion of their period of service, the same scale of pensions that other petty officers in Her Majesty's Navy now receive?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The rates of pension for naval schoolmasters were recently improved, though they were not actually assimilated in all respects to those in force for chief petty and petty officers. The Order in Council of the 3rd of August last removes the limit that was placed on schoolmasters' pensions, and extends to men of over 20 years' service the same rate for each year served as is awarded to chief and petty officers.

INCOME TAX (IRELAND) — OVERCHARGE, EDENAGEE, CO. FERMANAGH.

MR. JORDAN (Clare, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. J. J. Maguire, of the town of Cavan, applied to the Surveyor at Enniskillen for repayment of overcharge in Income Tax out of the lands of Edenagee, County Fermanagh; if said Surveyor informed him that the papers relating thereto were in the office in Dublin; if he has written repeatedly to the Commissioners there, without receiving any reply; and, if the Commissioners will be instructed to give due attention to the matter?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.), in reply, said, that there was some misunderstanding in this case, owing, firstly, to a mistake in the addresses of the letters, and, secondly, to a confusion between two persons who were concerned. The memorial on the subject of Mr. Maguire's complaint was before Somerset House, and would be duly dealt with. As to the statement that Mr. Maguire had not received replies to his letters, he was informed that every communication he sent had been answered.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. C. E. LEWIS (Londonderry) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering the importance of the Vote for the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Government would undertake that it should come on at a reasonable hour of the evening, or at the commencement of a Sitting?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.) said, that the Government agreed with the hon. Member as to the importance of the Royal Irish Constabulary Vote, and thought that the Vote ought to be taken at a time which would be convenient to the House; and, therefore, they would undertake that it should come on at the commencement of a Sitting; but as to the other Votes they were desirous of proceeding with the Estimates, as far as possible, in the order in which they had been placed before the House.

Mr. C. E. LEWIS said, that in consequence of the answer he would not that evening proceed with his Motion for an official inquiry into the conduct of the magistrates and police in Derry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE METROPOLITAN COMMON FUND — QUOTA FOR OFFICERS' RATIONS.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) rose to move—

> "That the scale fixed by the Local Government Board for the cost of the rations of the officers of the Metropolitan Unions, repayable out of the common fund, is grossly inadequate, not in accordance with the intention of the Legislature, and unfair to the poorer districts; and that this House is of opinion that the immediate revision of the scale is a matter of pressing urgency;"

when——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he has introduced a Bill, which is now standing on the Paper for a second reading, which contains a distinct reference to the subject-matter of the present Motion; and, as that Bill is to be brought on upon a future day, the hon. Member would not be in Order in moving his Resolution now, as he would be anticipating the discussion upon the Bill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: May I point out that the Bill which I propose to bring forward is intended to bring about an alteration in the law, while the grievance complained of in the Resolution is that the Local Government Board do not carry out the existing law. I only wish to insist upon one of the most ancient principles of the Constitution—that the consideration of grievances should precede Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of grievance preceding Supply; but it is a question of the hon. Member infringing an Order of the House.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: May I ask you, Sir, if I should be in Order in making some remarks on the special subject I have referred to?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member would not be in Order in anticipating the discussion upon his Bill.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—THE BARBAVILLA CONSPIRACY.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. TUITE (Westmeath, N.): I rise to move the Resolution of which I gave Notice early in the evening, and which has reference to the case of the Barbavilla conspiracy to murder. We are in a position to prove that the persons now undergoing penal servitude for that conspiracy to murder have been unjustly convicted, and should be released.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the Resolution which he proposes to move is not pertinent to any of the Estimates before the House. The salaries of the Judges who administer justice in Ireland are not included in these Estimates; and the conduct of the Sheriff, or of any officer whose salary is embraced in the Estimates, is not impugned by the hon. Member. I understand that the hon. Member proposes to impugn the conduct of the late Lord Lieutenant, and the salary of the late Lord Lieutenant is not in question. I am bound by the Standing Order, which says that no question shall be raised as a Motion, except such as appertain to the Estimates to be taken in Supply.

Mr. TUITE: What I desire to call attention to is the action of the Lord Lieutenant in refusing an inquiry. The administration of justice in Ireland has thereby been impaired. We are ready to produce the new evidence which has been forthcoming since the trials in support of the allegations which have been made as to the innocence of the prisoners.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lord Lieutenant's salary is not upon these Estimates, and I do not see how the object of the hon. Member can be attained without infringing the Standing Order.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): On the point of Order I would respectfully submit that the salaries of the Lord Lieutenant and of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who represents the Lord Lieutenant in this House, are dealt with in the Estimates. The Lord Lieutenant is responsible for the prerogative of mercy in Ireland; and I contend that the Motion of my hon. Friend is, therefore, pertinent to the Estimates, because it complains that the prerogative has not been exercised in the Barbavilla case.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member proposes to discuss a general subject. Last year I gave a ruling which, I think, completely covers the point now raised. Mr. Hopwood, who was then a Member of the House, proposed, on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply upon the Civil Service Estimates, to move a Resolution on the subject of appeals in criminal cases. That may have seemed to deal, to a certain extent, with the Estimates then before the House; but I ruled that it was a general question, and that, as it did not deal with any special Estimate proposed to be taken, it did not come within the Standing Order that any Resolution moved must appertain to the Estimates before the House.

EDUCATION (GRANTS TO SCHOOLS).

RESOLUTION.

MR. CONWAY (Leitrim, N.), in rising to move—

"That this House is of opinion that it is expedient that every school conducted in suitable premises, with an attendance of not less than thirty scholars, under a duly certified teacher or teachers, and complying with the other provisions of the Code, and favourably reported on by Her Majesty's Inspector as being efficiently taught, shall be entitled to a share in the annual Parliamentary Grant for Public Education,"

said, that at the time Board schools were first introduced it was intended that they should only supplement voluntary schools where the latter did not meet the necessities of the districts; but in the small country places, where the School Boards were not so enlightened as in, for instance, London or Liverpool, the Boards refused to give their consent to the building of new voluntary schools, and ignored the claims of the denominationalists. The House ought to come to the rescue of the voluntary schools, and prevent small Boards, such as those he had referred to, refusing their consent. If the Motion were adopted, he contended that no harm would be done to the cause of popular education. The grievances which the people complained of would be removed, and the schools which were fulfilling all the conditions of the Code would be sharing in the grant for public elementary education. Since the Education Act came into force no fewer than 48 of these voluntary schools had been suppressed by a powerful minority, and £6,000,000 sunk in aid of the cause of education was practically lost. His Resolution was intended to rescue the denominational schools, and, at the same time, to relieve the Vice President of the Council of much labour connected with all schools which complained of the action of the Board.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that it is expedient that every school conducted in suitable premises, with an attendance of not less than thirty scholars, under a duly certified teacher or teachers, and complying with the other provisions of the Code, and favourably reported on by Her Majesty's Inspector as being efficiently taught, shall be entitled to a share in the annual Parliamentary Grant for Public Education,"—(*Mr. Conway*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead) said, he was inclined to agree with a great deal of what had fallen from the hon Member. The House might not be aware that the Motion stated exactly the practice of the Department which was followed in districts not under School Boards; but he understood the chief objection of the hon. Member to apply to cases within a School Board district, and to the fact that voluntary schools were not allowed to earn grants in a district where a Board school had been once set up. In considering this point it was necessary to bear in mind that a School Board was not started unless there was a deficiency of voluntary work. A School Board was only called into action when they could not obtain a voluntary school in a district to supply insufficiency of school accommodation. Upon failure of voluntary action the Department had no option but to fall back on the ratepayers, and insist on their finding school accommodation. Directly a School Board was started it had certain powers vested in it by the Act of Parliament; it was bound to find sufficient accommodation in the district; and, further, if at any subsequent time sufficient accommodation was wanting, it was bound to provide it. The Education Department was bound to see that sufficient accommodation was provided, and the School Board were bound by the Act of 1870 to provide it. Supposing that the managers of a voluntary school came forward and said that they desired to start a voluntary school within a School Board district, it was the duty of the Department first to ascertain whether there was or was not sufficient suitable accommodation in the district; and if there was sufficient the Department would not allow a grant to the voluntary school. If they did, it would be hardly fair by the ratepayers who had had to contribute to the School Board, and who, in fact, had created a public elementary school which was giving sufficient accommodation for the district. It must be observed, also, that if this concession was made to one voluntary and denominational school, it must be made to any others in the district that could fulfil the conditions and secure the minimum average attendance. This would tend to the multiplication of small rival schools, unnecessary from the educational point of view; there would be danger of lowering the standard of education, as was found to be the case in small schools as compared with larger schools; and there would be an unnecessary expenditure, as every school, however small, must have the proper staff. Supposing, again, a time arrived when there was not sufficient accommodation in the district, and a representation to that effect was made to the Department, they would at once call on the School Board to find sufficient accommodation. If the managers of a voluntary school came forward and said, "Give the grant to us, and we will find that accommodation," the Education Department would be obliged in these circumstances, according to the present system, first to say to the School Board, "Will you find that accommodation? If not, we shall give the grant to the voluntary school; but it is your duty first to find the accommodation, and we call upon you to do your duty." If the School Board is unwilling or fails to provide the accommodation, the Department would make a grant to a voluntary school fulfilling the necessary conditions; or they would make that grant at once to the school, if the Board assented to the want of accommodation being supplied by a voluntary school. Where a voluntary school had been started for denominational purposes in a School Board district, and was certified as efficient, if it came to the Education Department and asked for a grant, it was the practice of the Education Department to say to the School Board, "Do you object to a grant being given to the school?" and the cases were very rare indeed in the large towns, and comparatively rare in the country, where the School Board objected. But School Boards did object sometimes, and especially, he thought, in Wales. In a case of that kind he agreed so far with the hon. Member as to wish that the Education Department had a little more power. He did not agree with the hon. Member in thinking that, if the Motion were adopted, it would relieve the Vice President of the Council of much labour; because, on the contrary, it would impose on the Department a more careful examination than now took place. But the Department ought to be prepared to take that responsibility; and, therefore, he agreed with the hon. Member so far. He hoped the hon. Member would not think that he was discourteous, or that he underrated the importance of the question, if he hesitated to discuss the full bearings of the Act and the Code on this point; and for this reason—that the whole matter, and other important questions of a kindred character, were at the present time under the consideration of a

Royal Commission on Elementary Education. Evidence had already been given on this point; the practice and system of the Department had been fully and ably stated by the Permanent Secretary of the Department; and further evidence would, no doubt, be forthcoming. Seeing, therefore, that if any change were made in the direction desired by the hon. Member, or in the direction indicated by himself, some legislation would be required, he thought the Education Department would not be justified in introducing legislation, or, indeed, any important change in the present system of education, until they were made aware of the views of the Royal Commissioners. He could assure the hon. Member that the question, which was one of importance, and in which great and increasing interest was felt throughout the country, would not be lost sight of. He trusted the hon. Member would be satisfied with having brought the matter before the House and obtaining a discussion upon it, and that he would not press for a division, but withdraw his Resolution.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said, that the Motion of the hon. Member was exactly consonant with the spirit of the Act of 1870. The object of that Act was not to supersede voluntary effort, but that the School Board system was to be supplementary to the existing voluntary system. In carrying out the Act, however, the English Education Department and also the School Boards had interpreted its meaning as if School Boards were to supplant private schools wherever they possibly could. The Vice President pointed out what he thought would be a hardship in the case of Board schools having been erected, and of private schools rising up afterwards. There was, practically, no hardship, supposing they sanctioned a private school where there was sufficient accommodation in the Board school, for this reason—that a school was not a profitable investment in any case. Apart from the cost of the school buildings, the maintenance of the school, however numerous the pupils, was a positive loss; and the loss need not be increased by a reduction of pupils, the School Board correspondingly reducing the teaching staff and expenditure. There was no reason why the community should not have the benefit of the private competition if the Board school, for any reason cognizant to the parents, was not doing its duty. He, therefore, considered that if there was a Board school half empty it was better that it should remain so, in order that the community should have the full benefit of the private enterprize and competition. The Vice President of the Council practically held the position that once a School Board was formed in a district there was an end to private enterprize, because if the School Board was willing to provide sufficient school accommodation, then private schools were to be kept out. The effect of that was simply that where a Board school had got possession of a district it would practically exclude private enterprize for all time coming, even if the private schools were able to increase their accommodation. The consequence would be that in England, as in Scotland, private enterprize would be driven out of the field, and education would be placed solely in the hands of the Board schools. When they reached the Scottish Education Estimates he would show that to be the result in Scotland, and they were tending in the same direction in England. He could not understand how there could be any objection to giving a grant to any voluntary school which complied with the conditions set forth in the Amendment. There was no fear of private enterprize starting useless schools. No managers would undertake the building of schools that would not fulfil the requirements of the Code, and they were not likely to do it out of mere grudge to the School Boards. It should be the object of the Department to foster and encourage education, and to give the community the benefit of this competition so long as they protected the interest of the ratepayers by refusing to give grants to schools unless they were thoroughly efficient in the terms of the Code.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE (Lancashire, N.E., Darwen) said, he desired to express his sympathy with the object of the hon. Member who had moved this Amendment. From the statement of the Vice President of the Council, he understood that in cases where there was no Board school the Department acted in accordance with the view expressed in the Amendment; but in cases where there were Board schools with sufficient accommodation there was a very great difficulty in the way of giving grants to voluntary schools, which he did not think the hon. Member for Glasgow appreciated. If the grant were given to the voluntary school as well as to the Board school the Department would have to pay twice over. In such cases he should be unwilling to see the House express any opinion; but it was different in cases where Board schools existed and did not give sufficient accommodation. In those circumstances he confessed he should like to see the Department give preference to the voluntary schools over the Board schools. That was a change in the law which he confidently looked for as a result of the Royal Commission sitting on the subject. Although sympathizing with the hon. Member, yet, as that Royal Commission was sitting, he trusted most earnestly that the hon. Member would not press his Motion to a division. At the present moment, when the Royal Commission was sitting, it was impossible for the House to come to any definite and satisfactory conclusion; and, at the same time, many hon. Members on the Conservative side of the House were unwilling to appear to be opposed to the objects of the Mover of the Amendment, with which they were in sympathy.

Mr. SALT (Stafford) observed, that the Amendment was limited in its scope, and did not express all the points that the Mover desired to bring forward. Moreover, although the views of the hon. Member met with sympathy from all parts of the House, yet, as had been pointed out, it would be better to let them go on until the subject was ripe for discussion than to force a division at that particular moment. This matter would be much better thrashed out by the Royal Commission than by a discussion in the House at the present time. As to the financial aspect of the question, he doubted whether the proposal of the hon. Member to give denominational schools, side by side with Board schools, the grant in certain cases, would really injure the ratepayers very much. If a portion of the children in a district were educated at the Board schools and a part at denominational schools, it could not injure the ratepayers to divide the Vote between them.

Mr. F. S. POWELL (Wigan) said, he thought the hon. Member, by his Amendment, had hit a blot in the Education Act; and he trusted that Her Majesty's Government, when they received the Report of the Royal Commission, would take steps without delay to remove what he considered a serious injustice. If at present, in a place where it was perceived that a growth of population would occur, persons out of their own funds built a school, he could see no reason why the Department should refuse to acknowledge it. This was one of many cases where great hardship and wrong was now inflicted under the present system. There were some districts where Board schools were not in accordance with the views of the population; and if they, out of their own fund, built a denominational school to give religious instruction with a proper teaching staff it ought to be recognized and receive the grant. He sincerely trusted that this question would not be allowed to drop, but that on some future occasion a change might be made in the law. In the meantime, the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment might be satisfied with the discussion that had taken place.

Mr. HARRIS (Galway, E.) said, he professed to be a Liberal, but he did not agree with that portion of the Liberal Party who were in favour of mixed as against denominational education. He thought it would be a truly Liberal programme to give denominational education to those who desired to have it.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) said, that considering the Ministry had expressed themselves to a great extent in sympathy with the views of the hon. Member, and considering that a Royal Commission was investigating the education question, he could not help feeling that his hon. Friend would be ill-advised if he proceeded further with his Motion at present.

Mr. CONWAY said, he would accept the advice of his hon. Friend (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) and withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

SCOTLAND—CONTRAVENTION OF THE TRUCK ACT. — OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said, that a few days ago he put a Question to the Secretary of State for the Home Department as to alleged breaches of the Truck Act in Scotland; and that right hon. and learned Gentleman answered that the Inspectors of Factories reported to him that they knew nothing of such breaches of the law. He (Mr. Bradlaugh) therefore took advantage of the present opportunity to show that the law upon that subject was, in Scotland, persistently, wilfully, and upon a wholesale scale broken. That applied to Tiree and Shetland, to Lanarkshire, and to part of Ayrshire. It was impossible that the Inspectors of Factories in the various districts could be ignorant of the fact; and if they pleaded ignorance to the Home Secretary, there must be some other reason for their want of knowledge than was apparent to the mind of a private Member. At a large meeting of coal and ironworkers, which he (Mr. Bradlaugh) attended, as did the hon. Members for the local divisions, at Motherwell, thousands of men declared that the whole of the labourers there present were cognizant of breaches of the Truck Act happening in the works in which they were employed, and a resolution was passed condemning the system declared to be largely in vogue in the county. He would not trouble the House with details as to Tiree, which was partially dealt with in the Report of the Crofters' Commission, nor would he on that occasion go into the breach of the law in Zetland and Fair Isle, though he held in his hand a careful statement of the breaches made on high and indisputable authority; he would confine himself to Lanarkshire, where the state of things seemed every bit as bad as when reported upon in 1871 by the Truck Commission, which thus described the practice as proved before them—

> "When a man wants an advance before pay day, he goes to the cashier or the clerk with his book, in which is entered the amount of work he has done. The cashier or clerk marks on the book the sum which the workman is to receive, and hands the book back to him with cash. On receiving the money the workman is expected to take it to the store and deliver it to the head storeman, who in return provides him with a line or ticket for the amount. This line is available for articles at the store to the extent of the figure written upon it. In some cases the man is permitted, either by the clerk or the storekeeper, to carry away a small proportion in actual cash, 1*s.* or 2*s.*, or 2*s.* 6*d.* in 10*s.*, being the usual allowance."

He (Mr. Bradlaugh) had investigated many cases; but the difficulty was that the men entreated that their names and addresses might not be given unless the Government took the matter up, as they would be at once dismissed from their employment and their families would starve. He had in his hand a pay-note which was issued within the last five weeks, and it contained two items, one for "cash" and the other was what was called the "cash account." The first thing that occurred to the mind was that it was somewhat extraordinary that two such separate items of cash should be printed on each man's pay-note. Really, the practice was to pay fortnightly, or at longer periods. The poor man, unable to exist, obtained an intermediate advance, but not until after he had earned it. Such advances were entered against the first "cash" in the pay-note; but for any money advanced upon this account he was charged interest, though the money had been already earned. The rate of interest was astounding. Upon the ticket before him the charge was 9*d.* for an advance of 15*s.* for five days; but the regular rate was 6*d.* for 10*s.* for a week, 1*s.* for £1, which was, at the lowest, 250 per cent per annum; and this was charged to men for lending them their own money. Then the second line "cash account" was the shop account, which was remarkable. The man applied, and got "a line" that nominally entitled him to receive a certain amount in cash; but, in reality, he could only obtain goods. If he should get cash, and with it buy goods elsewhere, he would have to leave the works. One poor man in Lanarkshire wrote him thus—

> "The proprietor one day was going into the town, and met one of his workmen's children with a basket on her arm; he looked into the basket and found a few provisions—he asked her where she had got them, and the girl telling him, he told the father he would not allow it, there was a shop there, and he must use it; and I believe it is very prevalent all through Scotland. I beg to say that I send this in all confidence, as I should suffer the penalty of instant dismissal should it become known."

He would not now delay the House from going into Committee by stating further instances; but if he could insure protection to the men he could furnish evidence of over 200 cases which he had himself investigated. The House might wonder why, the law being so audaciously broken, it was not enforced in

Scotland, as it had been recently by the Treasury in Wales. Prosecutions in Scotland were conducted by the Procurator Fiscal in all cases in which that official could get his expenses; but, curiously enough, the Truck Act was drawn by English lawyers, who made no provision for prosecutions being conducted in Scotch Courts. That difficulty had been noted by the Truck Commission of 1870; and he would trouble the House with the following extract from the examination by the Royal Commissioners of the Procurator Fiscal of the Hamilton district—

> "Can you inform us whose duty it is? It is the duty of every man who finds himself aggrieved.—But of nobody in particular? Of nobody in particular.—Suppose a miner were aggrieved, would the information be given to you, or to the police? To either; but I never had an information of the kind.—And I rather gather from what you have said that you would not move in the matter, although you had? I would not.—Then to whom ought a complaining miner to make his complaint? He would require to employ an agent to conduct his case for him, and proceed in his own name.—Even if he was complaining of a criminal offence? If he was complaining of an offence against the Truck Act.—And wished to prosecute? Yes, and wished to prosecute.—I am not talking of a case in which he wished to recover money back? No; I am speaking of a contravention of the Truck Act.—Then he would have to employ an agent at his own expense, and proceed in his own name? Yes.—Suppose he were to complain to the police, what would they tell him? That he must proceed himself.—Is not that a very exceptional state of things in the law? It is so; I do not remember any other Act of Parliament in the same condition."

And yet the law has been left in this unsatisfactory state. The Procurators Fiscal did not, unfortunately, take up prosecutions in cases of breach of the Truck Act; nor, perhaps, could they be expected to do so until they knew they would get their expenses paid, and that was a state of things which he desired to see remedied. He was advised that to secure this it needed a short amending Bill to enact—(1) That all prosecutions under the Truck Acts may be brought in the Sheriffs' Courts, and by the Procurators Fiscal thereof; (2) That the expenses of such prosecutions should enter the Sheriffs' accounts against their counties, and be repayable in Exchequer, as in other prosecutions; and (3) That pecuniary penalties adjudged by Sheriffs should be accounted for by them in Exchequer. The Royal Commission of 1870 had denounced, and he (Mr. Bradlaugh) would again denounce, this truck system as demoralizing in the highest degree. The Secretary of State for the Home Department said that he had no information upon the matter, though it was perfectly well known to 30,000 or 40,000 workmen. He was not attacking the right hon. and learned Gentleman personally, who had received his (Mr. Bradlaugh's) statements with great courtesy, and who, he believed, desired to suppress this shameful system. But it was the Secretary of State who had to answer in that House. He (Mr. Bradlaugh) had in his possession allegations of cases where employers, reputed for their honour and integrity, and who gave large donations to churches, had beer shops and whisky stores at the doors of their places of business, and who advanced money to the men to go in and spend in these places, and charged them, in addition, 250 per cent interest on the advances. It was intolerable that when breaches of the Truck Act had almost entirely disappeared in England and were punished in Wales, the law should be allowed to become a dead letter in Scotland. The putting of the law in force should surely not be left to poor ignorant men without pecuniary means, who could not proceed without employing law agents' counsel.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.) said, that he could not follow the hon. Gentleman upon the province of fact into which he had entered. He had done his best within the last week to make inquiries on the subject. He had some, although imperfect, information with regard to Tiree; and he was bound to say about it that, although the state of things was by no means satisfactory, and one for which he could wish to see a remedy, he was not satisfied that what took place there could be reached by the Truck Act at all. As he gathered, the workmen in Tiree, who were paid in goods instead of money, were not artificers within the meaning of the Truck Act. They were simply persons who collected sea weed or tangle, which was ultimately used for glass manufacture, but who were not employed in any manufacturing process. Moreover, in extenuation of the practice which seemed to prevail in Tiree of giving these labourers goods instead of money for their wages, various excuses were urged by the employers. Some said that the workmen themselves preferred it. He would scrutinize a plea like that closely before accepting it. Others alleged that the system of giving meal was preferred by the men.

MR. BRADLAUGH: That very excuse was made and dealt with by the Truck Commissioners, who rejected it as an invalid excuse.

MR. MATTHEWS said, that the Crofters' Commission had dealt with the case of payment with meal instead of coin, and expressed no very positive conclusion on the subject. They did not state positively whether the custom prevailed so as to bring it within the Truck Act. Another excuse was made, and if true would, he thought, be a valid one, that the difficulty of reaching Tiree was so great, owing to stormy weather, that the getting of regular supplies of coin was a matter of almost impossibility. He did not pretend so set himself on an equality of zeal with the hon. Member in this matter; but he claimed the next place to him in zeal, and he would assure the hon. Member that if any efforts could tend to prevent any abuse which came within the letter or the spirit of the Truck Act, they should not be wanting in order to protect the workmen, whose cause was advocated with such ability by the hon. Member. With regard to what went on in Lanarkshire, he was not able to assist the hon. Gentleman with any statement of facts at present; he had done his utmost within the last four or five days to get information on the matter. He had no reason whatever to doubt the accuracy of the information which the hon. Gentleman had laid before the House, but he was not at present able to confirm it; and, of course, the hon. Member would not expect him to take official action without that confirmation. He had reason to suspect, though he did not know yet, that the system to which the hon. Member had alluded of charging what was called a "commission" by some employers for advances of wages did exist in that part of Scotland. The Scotch law seemed to him to be as impenetrable as a Scotch mist, and he did not profess to have any knowledge of the subject; and the Lord Advocate, he was sorry to say, was not at his elbow to enlighten him. At the same time, he thought that the system of making a workman's wages payable every fortnight, and to charge him 6*d*. or 1*s*. for an advance of 10*s*., was a very great abuse, and if it was not freely and voluntarily consented to by the workmen themselves it was a matter which any friend of the workmen would be justified in protesting against. As to compelling them to deal at a particular shop, the hon. Member was as good a judge as he was whether that was against the spirit of the Truck Act; and if he could do anything with the assistance of the Secretary for Scotland and the advice of the Lord Advocate, he and they would do their utmost to stimulate Procurators Fiscal and to induce them to inquire into these matters.

MR. DONALD CRAWFORD (Lanark, N.E.) said, he regretted that he had not known beforehand that the hon. Member for Northampton was to bring forward this subject to-night. If he had he would have looked into the law of the subject, and would also have endeavoured to get more facts from the county of Lanark than he had at present. In fact, he was not aware that the Forms of the House would have allowed of the subject being brought forward now. If he had it would have been his business to bring forward the subject himself, as he was aware that it was regarded with great interest in the county. The abuses complained of in Lanarkshire were of two kinds. The one was the system of poundage by which a miner got an advance on his wages on what he had earned, and was charged an exorbitant interest upon it. He might explain to the Home Secretary that this was a matter which had nothing whatever to do with the Scottish law. It required no familiarity with the Scottish law, and the Truck Act and the subsidiary Acts dealing with the subject were equally applicable to every part of the United Kingdom. There was no doubt a very considerable difference of opinion from the information he had received as to how far the system of truck prevailed in Lanarkshire. But he quite agreed with his hon. Friend that it did prevail to a considerable extent. He knew one employer who denied that the shop system continued in existence now, although it was very bad 15 years ago, and who was even astonished to hear that the system of poundage prevailed, although there was no doubt it did. He would press the matter on the attention of the Home Secretary and the Secretary for Scotland; but would not express any conclusion himself on the subject just now, not having had an opportunity to look into the law on the subject. No doubt the Truck Commissioners 15 years ago pointed out that the machinery of the law for bringing breaches of the Truck Act before Courts of Justice was ineffective as regarded Scotland. It was constructed for England. The statement of the hon. Member for Northampton that the hitch lay in the non-provision for expenses did not explain the whole cause for inaction. There was frequently difficulty in prosecuting what were called *quasi*-criminal offences. Criminal offences were prosecuted by the Public Prosecutor, and that official did not receive or ask for his cost; but in *quasi*-criminal cases, such as breaches of the Factory or Truck Acts, difficulty sometimes arose, although it might be got over occasionally. The Solicitor General for Scotland would probably corroborate him in saying that it was sometimes got over by the issuing of an order, as it was in the power of the Lord Advocate to do, directing that the Procurators Fiscal should conduct such prosecutions. One point he asked the Home Secretary to consider was how far the law as regarded the mode of bringing offences against the Truck Act before the Courts of Law might be amended; and the second point he asked the right hon. Gentleman to consider was whether the Truck Act covered the system of poundage. The shop system and the poundage system were a very great hardship to the workmen; and he asked the Home Secretary and the Lord Advocate to consider whether the present law would suffice, and whether it ought not to be extended.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) said, that in all the Highland quarries the truck system was in operation. When in Argyllshire in June and July, before the present Lord Advocate was appointed, he had called his attention to the matter, particularly in connection with the Easdale quarries. The probability was that in Tiree, the Procurator Fiscal being the agent of the proprietor, nothing was done. He knew that in his own county the truck system prevailed in the flagstone quarries; and the Procurator Fiscal, being also agent for the proprietor, winked at it. There the men were paid, not once a fortnight, but every three months. The accounts were made up every three months, and then the men had to wait another month before receiving payment. The only pier to which a ship could bring coals belonged to the Company who had only once in a considerable number of years allowed any ship to come there except their own. They imported meal and coal, and sold them to their men, and the local merchants could not compete with them. He was glad the Home Secretary had taken up the question; and he hoped that by next Session they should find the subject had been investigated, and that the Procurator Fiscal, who had been tolerating, if not aiding and abetting, would receive proper attention.

Mr. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said, he wished to point out that in Scotland there was a civil remedy for these grievances. If a workman were paid in kind he could sue for payment in money, going back for a considerable period; and if he were in the position of not being able to conduct the prosecution, the law of Scotland provided him with counsel, provided he could show a *primâ facie* case. Therefore a remedy was within the reach of even the poorest man in Scotland, and expenses would always follow the success of the case. With regard to poundage it was difficult to bring it under the Truck Act, because the matter was outside the contract of service, the workman desiring payment in advance. That was a private arrangement between him and his master. Under the law as it at present stood he did not think that that would necessarily come under the Act. It was a question whether it ought not to be brought under the Act; but he merely wished to point out that a civil remedy at present existed.

HOSPITALS AND INFIRMARIES (IRELAND)—THE ROYAL HOSPITAL, BELFAST.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.) said, he wished to ask the Government what course they would pursue in reference to the Belfast Royal Hospital? The board of management had forwarded a Memorial on the subject of the strain on their means owing to the late riots; and he was sure the Government would deal liberally with the demand for aid. The Belfast Royal Hospital was entirely supported by voluntary contributions, and had never received Government assistance; but the recent riots had made an extraordinary demand upon the resources of the institution, for, for weeks and weeks, wounded persons — some wounded by the rioters, others by the forces of the Crown — were continually brought in. Already there was a deficit in the accounts for the year, and the Governors would have been entitled to close their doors to the afflicted on the ground that they had no money to carry on the work. However, in a humane and public spirit these gentlemen opened their wards to 369 victims of gunshot and other wounds. The careful treatment given to these was in most cases successful. Deaths had been prevented, and families saved from much sorrow, and the area of destitution greatly limited. This was a case of great magnitude. At the time of the riots the funds of the hospital were some £300 behind, and now this deficit was increased to £1,100. If this £800 were made good the Governors would be enabled to meet the ordinary admission of wounded and sick. Before their dependence was always on voluntary subscriptions; but owing to the general depression in business the subscribers were unable to increase the amounts of their gifts. Hence he saw nothing for it but for the Government, if it did not intend to be parsimonious, to help to save the Governors from the necessity of closing the hospital's doors. The Government allowed about £15,000 a-year to certain hospitals in Dublin, and about £18,000 to Government hospitals. He did not suggest a redistribution of these grants; but he did think that an emergency grant of £800 to the Belfast institution by the Government should be made.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.) said, the question was entirely new to him, for he had seen nothing of the Memorial from the Governors of the hospital to which allusion had been made. That Memorial would not come before him necessarily; but he would undertake, in conjunction with the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for Ireland, to go carefully into the circumstances of the case. He was not willing that the hon. Member should have the chance of bringing, with any show of justice, a charge of parsimony in this case against the Government. The hon. Member, he believed, did not ask for an annual grant—[Mr. SEXTON: Nothing of the kind.]—but an exceptional and special grant. [Mr. SEXTON: Hear, hear!] Well, that being the case, if it was the opinion of the Authorities in Ireland that a special grant should be made from the Treasury to this hospital on account of the expense it was put to in consequence of the riots, he, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, should throw no difficulty in the way of that being done.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ADMINISTRATION.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. TUITE (Westmeath, N.) said, he rose to call attention to the administration of justice in Ireland, and to the fact that successive Lords Lieutenant of Ireland, in the face of new facts which had come to light in connection with the Barbavilla prisoners, had neglected their administrative duties. His Friends and himself were ready now to offer evidence strong enough to have those unfortunate men released and restored to their homes. They had the evidence of a constable who himself was engaged in these trials, and who would prove that the very sources of justice in Ireland were polluted. The hon. Gentleman proceeded to refer to the Barbavilla murder.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that I have already ruled, at an earlier period of the evening, that the question of the Barbavilla murder has no reference whatever to the Estimates now before the House. The Standing Order states that distinctly—that no question shall be raised or Motion made that is not strictly relevant to the Estimates to be taken in Supply. I have already allowed two subjects to be brought before the House, because in my opinion they were pertinent to the Estimates—namely, the Motion proposed by the hon. Member for North Leitrim (Mr. Conway), and the question of the Truck Act, raised by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh). Those two subjects are clearly connected with grants contained in the present Estimates. But the subject which the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. Tuite) now seeks to bring before the House is, in my opinion, not relevant to the Estimates, and cannot, therefore, be discussed.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) said, he wished to point out the enormous expense which was incurred in Ireland by employing the Constabulary to assist the landlords in carrying out evictions. He did not think it fair that the ratepayers should be burdened by the cost of the evictions of Irish tenants. He had a strong opinion that it was not the Government's duty to assist landlords at enormous public expense, more especially in cases of ejectment, where there was no movable property on the premises for distraint. He believed the Government would be justified in aiding a fair levy of personalty; but when they went so far as to expend a monstrous sum of money on an almost pauperized peasant, he thought the public ratepayers had a right to enforce a claim of consideration for their interests, and not be punished in addition to the evicted people, who would become immediately chargeable to the rates as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I do not understand how the hon. Member can connect the question of evictions in Ireland with these Estimates.

Mr. BIGGAR: I am perfectly aware that there is nothing in the Estimates; but that is another argument in favour of my contention; but, from a public point of view, the Government, in lending their aid to these evictions, have displayed very bad judgment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite out of Order in the observations he is making.

Mr. BIGGAR: Shall I not be in Order in giving my view of the evictions which from time to time have been carried out in Ireland, and of the experience which we have gained of the action of the Government in connection with them? Not long ago a gun-boat was wrecked off the coast of Donegal while engaged in assisting the landlords to levy rents to a small amount in Tory Island. The Constabulary Vote appears in these Estimates, and I want to know why the Government should expend the public money in the employment of the police to assist the landlords in enforcing executions and evictions?

Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in the Estimates which refers to the subject, and the hon. Member is altogether out of Order.

Mr. Biggar resumed his seat.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): There is a subject in connection with the Irish Constabulary which has been a long-standing grievance in Ireland, and I hope I shall not be ruled out of Order in calling attention to it. The Standing Order provides that any subject may be discussed on first going into Supply upon the particular class of Estimates to which it relates. I see that in Class III. the Vote for the Irish Constabulary is to be taken; and, therefore, I think I am entitled to call attention to the character of the expenditure under that head. It is a notorious fact that the cost of the Irish Constabulary has long been greatly in excess, having regard to the number of population, to that of any other country on the face of the earth; and, instead of showing any sign of diminution, it has gone on steadily increasing year by year. If attention is not directed to it, in all probability it will still continue to increase. The whole Vote has been augmented in nearly every single item. There is one particular item bearing on this point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Committee—the item for the Transport Service. This year it has increased from £1,500 to £5,000, which I cannot help regarding as a monstrous state of things. The increase itself is no less than 200 per cent, or £3,500 upon a Vote of £1,500. The cause of this increase is not difficult to understand by those who have watched the course of events in Ireland. It is all owing to the unreasonable action of certain landlords. A considerable portion of it will go, no doubt, to pay the expenses of the large body of police which has been concentrated at Gweedore in order to assist in the evictions which have been carried out there, and in the course of which the amount of money collected for the landlord did not exceed £20, although the expense of that campaign to the country will at the very least amount to £500. I think this is a very strong case to justify the dissatisfaction which is expressed in Ireland against the conduct of the Executive. Then, again, there has been a continual campaign carried on by Lord

Kenmare against his tenantry—carried on at enormous expense, and leading also to other contingent expenses owing to the large number of police it is necessary to provide for the protection of his property, and which costs several hundreds of pounds annually. The other day a body of no less than 700 or 800 police was concentrated in the town of Woodford. The traders of Portumna refused to supply them with provisions, and transports had to be employed at an enormous expense to carry them, in their own carts, a distance of 30 or 40 miles. After the campaign had lasted for some days three or four men were evicted, and the amount of rent collected certainly fell short of £100. Altogether the campaign, which has excited the public mind and created a great deal of annoyance, will have cost the country £400 or £500 at the very least. And this is not all; because if hon. Members will look into the details of the case they will find that when the campaign was over it was found that the tenants against whom it was undertaken were altogether destitute, and it would never have been undertaken if the landlords would have consented to meet the tenants in a reasonable spirit. Because the landlord would not meet his tenants the whole Forces of the Crown have been put into operation at an enormous expense to the country, contrasted with the result. It is said that the Government had no discretion in the matter, but that they are obliged to place the Forces of the Crown at the disposal of the Sheriff whenever he requires their aid. I know that perfectly well; but I contend that it is the business of the Irish Government to ask and insist upon obtaining some measure from Parliament to relieve them of this odious duty until some better settlement of the Land Question can be arrived at. I raised the question in this House last week; but I am sorry to say that I got no satisfaction. Since then the evil has gone on unchecked, and therefore I feel it my duty to raise it again. Upon every opportunity I shall continue to protest against the waste of public money in carrying out unreasonable evictions in Ireland. It is ridiculous to tell me that the Irish Executive have no choice in the matter. My answer is that they ought to come to this House and ask for powers that will give them a discretion so far as lending the assistance of the police is concerned. Any sensible man must see that the entire population of Woodford were in unanimity. It became necessary to supply the police with provisions drawn from a distance of 30 or 40 miles, and that fact alone must convince every man of common sense that there is something radically wrong in the state of the law. During the campaign something like £400 or £500 were spent in bringing in provisions—which sum would have been a God-send to the poor shopkeepers in the West of Galway, and yet so intense was their feeling that none of them would consent to take a single farthing of the money. The feeling must not only have been unanimous, but exceedingly strong; and I think the time has come when it is absolutely necessary to introduce a measure to give the Executive Government discretionary powers. I think I am perfectly entitled to draw the attention of the Government to this matter, and to make an appeal to the House for sympathy towards these poor people during the coming winter, in view of the destitution which is likely to exist. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary will be able to give us some hope that this expectation will not be disappointed, and that the Government will refuse to send out large bodies of the police upon similar expeditions as that to Woodford, and that before Parliament is prorogued they will be able to provide some measure of relief.

MR. CHARLES GRAY (Essex, Maldon) said, he rose to call attention to the hardship to farmers caused by their having to go long distances at inconvenient times in order to appeal against assessments of taxes under Schedules A and B, when, he contended, the amount at which they had been assessed was manifestly absurdly high.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I rise to Order. I beg to submit to you, Sir, that the hon. Gentleman is out of Order in raising a question as to the Income Tax appeals against the assessment under Schedules A and B. There is no Vote in the Estimates about to be brought on which relates to Income Tax appeals, and the matter is altogether in the hands of local Commissioners, whose services are rendered voluntarily. There is no charge whatever for their services in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: As far as the local Commissioners are concerned, the remarks of the hon. Member have no reference to anything that appears in the Estimates; but I understand that he was advocating a policy of appeal to the Commissioners of the Inland Revenue, and, as far as they are concerned, his remarks would be pertinent.

MR. CHARLES GRAY said, the farmers thought so much of the hardship that they often preferred not to appeal, and then it was said of them that times could not be so bad as they represented them to be because they paid taxes on so high an income. He hoped the Government would try and make the procedure of appeals in such cases more simple and less inconvenient than they were.

MR. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.) said, he rose to complain of the very large sum of money spent on the Royal Irish Constabulary, which had lately been increasing. For the reason of that increase he contended they had not far to seek, and if they took the trouble to inquire they would find it to be owing to the forces of the Crown being lent to Irish landlords for the purpose of enabling them to extract extravagant rents from poor Irish tenants. Hon. Members from Ireland maintained that it was necessary that a suspension of evictions should now take place, otherwise they believed that it would be the duty of the Government, considering the social state of the country and the inability of the tenants to pay rent, to bring in a Bill to temporarily suspend evictions. If evictions were suspended the great cost of which he complained would be largely curtailed, because much of the expense was incurred in looking after derelict farms, which were of no value to those who lived on them, as their property was the landlords, or creditors, and were merely curses in the district, causing crime, and arousing the spirit of retaliation. He urged the House to insist on lessening this criminal expense by checking evictions. He was sure such a course would be advantageous to the tenant and landlord alike, and would largely restore peace and tranquillity to Ireland. The hon. Member was proceeding to enlarge on this point, when——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is speaking more particularly of evictions than of the employment of the police, and the policy of evictions has nothing to do with the Constabulary Vote.

MR. P. J. POWER: I was endeavouring to point out that the increased cost of the police was due to their employment at evictions, and that is a work which we consider to be not only unnecessary, but ill-advised.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.) said, it was rather difficult to understand the precise object of the discussion which had been going on for some time. The House could not on that occasion enter into the question of the law with regard to evictions. That had been discussed at great length during the debate on the Address, and the House would have before long another debate on the same subject raised on the Bill which he understood the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) intended shortly to introduce. For these reasons, therefore, he could not understand why the question should be raised now, or what profit, even if it were in Order, would result from the discussion. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) had raised a point in reference to the expenses of the Constabulary and their transport. He was quite aware that those expenses were large, and that they had increased materially; but the hon. Member and his Friends did not charge the Government with any improper or illegal action in the matter. They admitted that, as the law now stood, expenses had to be incurred, and their arguments only went to show that the law which existed at present ought to be altered. But that was a question which it was impossible for the House to discuss at that stage. So far as the expenses were concerned, he could assure the House that no one regretted charges of that kind more than Her Majesty's Government. Why were these charges so large? Not from any desire on the part of the Government, or, he was quite sure, on the part of the late Government, to use the Constabulary to assist landlords to evict tenants, but because the Government, by reason of their position, were compelled to respond to the demands which were made upon them, not by landlords, but by Sheriffs and Sub-Sheriffs, for the protection of themselves and their officers in the execution of a duty which the law imposed upon them. Hon. Members had referred to the large expenditure which undoubtedly had been incurred the other day in carrying out certain evictions at Woodford. But any hon. Member who had seen the accounts of what occurred on that occasion would admit that, but for the presence of a large force of Constabulary, not only would the Sheriffs and their officers have been subjected to the grave and serious assaults which were committed upon them, but it would have been impossible for them to carry out a duty which the law imposed upon them. The Government, therefore, were obliged, in response to the request of the Sheriffs, to send Constabulary into the district for the preservation of peace and the protection of the officers of the law. Indeed, the whole history of that event showed, not an inability on the part of the evicted tenants to pay their rents, but a determined and desperate combination of the whole of the inhabitants of that district against the execution of the law. He did not wish to enter now into the reasons of that combination. It might be, as the hon. Member who spoke last considered, that the law was not in accordance with the wishes of the population. In that case let the hon. Member and his Friends apply to Parliament to alter the law. That was not a matter to be discussed on the Constabulary Vote. But if hon. Members desired to question the mode in which that Vote was expended, and the details of that expenditure, it would be much easier to do so on the Vote itself, on which his noble Friend had promised a good opportunity for discussion. He hoped that hon. Members would not think it necessary to continue the debate on this occasion, but that they would permit the House to proceed with the Business of Supply, and then hon. Members would come in due course to the discussion of the particular Vote in which they took so proper and great an interest.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) said, he recognized the conciliatory manner in which the right hon. Gentleman made his appeal; and he could assure him, on the part of his hon. Friends, that it was not intended to have a long discussion on this particular subject at the present stage. But they felt that it was incumbent upon them to protest against the system of misusing the Constabulary of Ireland, as was done at the present time. They had a right to raise the question, and they were impelled by a sense of public duty to do so. Every increase which was made to the Constabulary Force, abnormally and preposterously numerous as that Force already was, might be traced to the attempts of this country to bolster up the landlords of Ireland in their rack-renting efforts. In the county of Kerry, which he had the honour to represent, there was an extra force of 300 constables. The contrast with the state of affairs in England had struck him very forcibly. He was not a person who was particularly attached to the society of constables, since on two or three occasions he had enjoyed more of their attentions than he desired. But it happened recently that in Newmarket, in Cambridgeshire, he did desire the assistance of the police, and he learned to his surprise that in that town of 6,000 inhabitants the whole police force consisted of four individuals; while in the town of Castleisland, in Kerry, they had the services of 97 policemen to keep the peace for 1,200 people. He stated without fear of contradiction that these extra constables were peacebreakers rather than peace-makers, or peace conservators. The noble Marquess at the head of the Government had called attention the other day to the number of men who were kept employed in protecting the Earl of Kenmare and a lady who resided near Tralee. Some of these constables who were in charge of the estates of this lady had been seen fetching band-boxes and bonnets from the lady's house to the nearest railway station. There were now eight or nine constables on special protection duty on account of this lady, and the calculation was that this special service cost £900 a-year. It was a serious matter that this charge should come upon the public, and be paid for out of the pockets of the ratepayers. He did not pretend for a moment to say that the protection which Kerry landlords had asked for was needless. As a Representative of the County Kerry he confessed with humiliation that in some cases protection was necessary. But he said also that the claim for protection had been abused. He instanced the case of Herbert in North

Kerry, who the other day obtained protection on the ground that he had been shot in the nail of his forefinger. No doubt Mr. Herbert was unpopular and desired protection. But Mr. Herbert had recently got a side-car for his own accommodation. Since he had got police protection the police rode about the country on the side-car, for the use of which he was paid, while he himself went about in his common cart. He thought the Government might with advantage give some supervision to these matters, to see that those who sought the protection of the police were not exposed to the temptation of making a good thing of the arrangement. He mentioned the case of another Kerry landlord who was well known in Tralee, who made sport of his protectors, dodging them in the market place so that he might be able to make a report against them. In another case, in the village of Currans, the constable who ought to be on protection duty outside the house of a farmer named Murphy was seated before the kitchen fire in the company of Miss Murphy, when, perhaps, in the course of demonstrating to her some scientific experiment or other his gun exploded, and the charge entered the arm of her brother. The constable and his companion in arms immediately began skirmishing round the premises outside, and made it appear that the brother had been shot through the window by a "Moonlighter." Thus the story was repeated in the English newspapers, the English public were horrified to read of another disgraceful and cowardly outrage in County Kerry. But although he had watched the newspapers carefully since he had found no contradiction or true explanation of the preposterous story. He mentioned the matter for the purpose of showing the exceptionally friendly relations on which the Constabulary entered with the people whom they were employed to protect, and asked how the people of the country could be expected to have confidence in the Constabulary under such circumstances as he had narrated? It was extremely hard that the people of the country should obtain a bad character on accouut of incidents like these. He did not say that crime and outrage did not occur. He had himself denounced crime and outrage at the risk of his life. But what he said was that the country was over-policed in a ridiculous manner. He had himself been driving back to Tralee a few nights ago from a place in County Kerry which he had been visiting, when he saw a figure rise out of a hedge by the wayside. It looked like a man dressed in a woman's petticoat. His first impulse was to throw a stone at him, as he suspected him of mischief; but it was fortunate that he restrained himself, since it turned out that the man was a sergeant of police, who had with him two armed policemen hiding behind the hedge. He ventured to say that if he had obeyed his first impulse and had cast the stone, he would not now have been present to trouble the House with his observations. The system under which the Constabulary warped their minds filled them with suspicions about everything and about everybody. The police were managed by the landlords. In the County Kerry the present High Sheriff, Mr. Meredith, was a landlord. His father-in-law was Clerk of the Peace and Assessor for the County. The Assessor's son—that was to say, the brother-in-law of the High Sheriff—was the Sub-Sheriff. Mr. Goodman, another relative of the family, was Vice Deputy or Deputy's Deputy of the High Sheriff. It was absurd to tell him after that that there was no connection between landlordism and the extra number of police employed in Kerry. The whole reason why so many extra police were employed in the County Kerry was that the whole administration of the county was in the hands of the landlords. The hon. Member proceeded to comment on the fact that General Buller, who had been sent down as a Special Commissioner to Kerry, stabled his horses with the Earl of Kenmare, whom the police were protecting, and lodged at the hotel where his Lordship's agent boarded. He objected to the maintenance of an inordinate police at the expense of the ratepayers in order to bolster up an oppressive landlordism. ["Oh!"] If the hon. Gentleman opposite had any fault to find with his statements let him reply in fair argument. An "Oh!" or an "Ah!" a grunt or a "Bah!" proved nothing. Something more logical was requisite in the House of Commons. He felt that if he much further detained the House he might not raise himself in its esteem. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen who cheered that statement no doubt meant to imply that he was doing something disreputable. Since that was the case, and he had no character left to lose in their estimation, he might continue his remarks. He proceeded to quote a case from the practice of the Land Court, in which a tenant had had his rent reduced from £145 10*s.* to £100. The meaning of this was that the tenant in this case had been unduly rack-rented to the amount of £45 10*s.* a-year. He objected to the imposition of an extra police upon a county to exact these rack-rents.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Gentleman is going into the whole subject of the Land Question in Ireland, and the only colourable justification he puts forward is the employment of the Constabulary, the pay of whom is included in the Estimates. The hon. Member is altogether out of Order.

MR. E. HARRINGTON : I feel that I have already received considerable indulgence from the Chair; and I will not, therefore, persevere further than to reiterate my contention that the need and occasion of this expenditure is the disturbed state of Ireland, and that if you will remove the irritating causes which have led to the necessity for increasing the Constabulary you will do something in the interests of humanity and towards securing the integrity of the Empire.

MR. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.) said, that the Constabulary were employed in some cases in large numbers where their services were perfectly useless, and an undue tax for their maintenance was cast upon the ratepayers. He hoped the Government would remedy that state of things, and also desist from so extensively using the police during the coming winter in enforcing evictions. He was surprised to hear the Chief Secretary make the statement that the non-payment of seed rate and rent, for the recovery of which the police were employed at vast expense, was not due to inability, but to unwillingness to pay. Why, there never was a debt so satisfactorily paid under such circumstances as had been the seed rate, the value received by the people under it being very much under what it would have been were it not for the delay of the Tory Government of the day to recognize in time the distress which prevailed. The absurdity of branches of the League, as alleged, encouraging people not to pay seed rate would be evident when it was recollected that every default in the payment of the rate increased the burden on the landholders in the division, who themselves constituted the greater proportion of the members of the League.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) said, it would be easy for him to quote a number of instances to show that the services of the police were abused. In one case in his own district a girl 10 years of age, who was suffering from fever, was one of a family whom the police assisted in evicting. The poor girl died next day. In another case the wife of one James Phelan, to whom a clergyman had administered the last rites of the Church, had been put out upon the ditch side, although the doctor in attendance certified that she was dying. In the district which he had the honour to represent the people were very poor, and in numbers of cases where the police attended evictions no benefit could be derived to the landlords, because the cost of the policemen was infinitely more than the chattels of these poor people would make when seized for the expenses of evictions. He contended that it was the duty of Irish Members to use every legitimate means in their power to bring forward these cases, and show how the English taxpayers were burdened for aiding the landlords in their acts of injustice and cruelty.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. B. KELLY (Donegal, S.) said, he cordially endorsed the observations of his hon. Friends who had preceded him. He came from a division of Donegal, and he could speak from personal painful familiarity with the facts that in that division evictions had taken place with painful frequency, and had been attended with those appalling circumstances that invariably distinguished evictions. Landlordism asserted its power in the most grinding way——

MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that the Question before the House had reference to the Constabulary.

MR. B. KELLY said, that as the Constabulary had been chiefly used for maintaining evictions in Ireland during recent years, he trusted he would not be out of Order if he referred to the painful circumstances with which evictions were attended. The police had been principally used in maintaining eviction in Ireland. He could speak from his own personal knowledge that in the district which he had the honour of representing a whole country side at the present time had been swept from their homes. The people had been cleared from their dwellings, and the police had been posted in those dwellings. Their presence there was an object of social discontent, for it was the direct cause of those social inconveniences and social disturbances that were much too frequently illustrated in Ireland. There was one landlord who had bought an estate in his district, and who had swept the poor people from their houses for arrears which they had believed had been wiped out. The Constabulary had there been enlisted to carry out the fell purposes of the landlord. He had been pointed out a most fruitful district in his division of five miles in extent where not the slightest vestige of human existence was to be found. He had been pointed out a bleak hillside where a poor widow and her children had been ruthlessly evicted. The police were there. At one eviction the authorities took the heartless course of engaging a drumming party to deaden the cries of the helpless children who were being driven from their homes. The Government lent all, and furnished all the powers at their command. He believed it was a proper and suitable thing for them to utter a protest against the voting away of money to uphold a force which had been identified in latter days with such heartless and cruel injustice.

DEPARTMENT OF WOODS AND FORESTS—ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said, he rose to call attention to the administration of the Woods and Forests Department. He had intended bringing forward the subject in Committee of Supply on the Vote for the salary of one of the Commissioners; but he thought this was a good opportunity to bring the matter under the notice of the Government. As the House was, no doubt, aware, the theory generally held was that at the commencement of the present reign a bargain was struck with Her Majesty the Queen to give up all the Crown lands in consideration of an addition to the Civil List. The cost of the Office of Woods and Forests in London alone amounted to £16,738; and, in addition to what appeared in the Estimates, there was a detailed account of receipts and expenditure in regard to Crown lands, which he supposed was laid on the Table of the House, because it was to be found in the Library. As an example of what was going on, he would take Windsor Park and Woods. There was an Estimate of £2,307 for the Windsor Home Park and Kitchen Gardens; and besides that there was the Windsor Forest. It must be remembered that a *quid pro quo* was given yearly for the income supposed to be derived from these properties, and the business of the House was to look at the matter in its commercial aspect. Most men would say that if the Crown would give them a lease for nothing of the Windsor Park and Forest they would accept it, and would expect to make a good thing out of it. But the Commissioners, whose receipts were £4,885, expended £26,218, so that there was a loss of £22,333 per annum. The outlay was accounted for by there being a Ranger and a Deputy Ranger and other officials. There was £327 for gamekeepers, and £245 was spent in improving the head-keeper's lodge. This was in the year 1884-5, and appeared in the Abstract of Accounts in the Library. There were repairs to lodges at Ascot and Datchet and the Royal stables and kennels, and these were put down at £4,815. Food for deer cost £418, and food for game—that was, for pheasants —£500. Who shot the pheasants? He believed it was Prince Christian. But it was never understood that in taking over this as a matter of business we were to provide game for His Royal Highness. There was £180 for a chaplain, but it was difficult to say what there was for him to do. The case of the New Forest was not so bad. The receipts of the New Forest were £13,632, as against an expenditure of £11,385; but, considering it was said that this Forest was kept up to obtain wood for the Navy, it could not be supposed that the sole amount of profit obtained was a little over £2,000 a-year. One item of expenditure was £103 for dog kennels, which presumably were required only by some Inspector or Ranger, and were therefore ordered at the public expense. Spread over the pages were items for schools and churches, sometimes not distinguishing what was given to each separately. The question arose whether these donations were confined to the Established Church, and if so why? When he was asked recently for a subscription to a church he said to the applicant—"No; go to your Bishops and ask them for a portion of their salaries; I shall give nothing."

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know how the hon. Member proposes to connect his remarks with the Estimates. It is altogether out of Order to enter into details on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, and further it is out of Order to refer to Estimates which are not now before the House, but which have been already disposed of in the previous Session.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Perhaps you will allow me to explain that the Vote I was referring to is not in Class I., but is Vote 25 of Class II., which includes the salaries of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. On that Vote I wish to raise the point that the administration is bad, and that something ought to be done in the matter. I have no desire to go into the details of the Vote.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be irregular to go into any details on any Vote submitted in Committee; and I understood that the hon. Member was referring to the Vote for Windsor Park, which has already been passed.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he would give way at once, but that the difficulty was that part of the expenditure was in the Vote, and part was shown only in the Return in the Library. However, as he was out of Order he would not discuss the matter in detail now; but he trusted the points he desired to raise would be looked into. In the Vote there were a Receiver General at £900, an Assistant Receiver General at £400, and £100 for clerical assistance; and in the Library it was shown that there were charges for professional services amounting to £5,800. He was given to understand that the gentleman who received the rents was paid 4 per cent thereon; and if he received £1,000 he would, as a matter of course, keep £40 and pay over £960. By an Act of George IV. the Department had the right to sell land and to grant leases, and in the shape of leases some persons got uncommonly good bargains. One gentleman had 2½ perches of land, with conveniences thereon, and part of the Grand Stand at Ascot, for £1 10*s.* per annum; and, as they knew, a box on Ascot Grand Stand was worth £30 or £40 per annum. Then, the Royal Yacht Squadron had Cowes Castle for £225 per annum; whereas, as a speculation, he would give £500 a-year for it if he could get a long lease. He thought he had at least made out a *primâ facie* case for some sort of investigation. Perhaps the Secretary to the Treasury would agree to the appointment of a Committee next Session. He understood there was to be a Committee appointed to look into the spending Departments of the State, and perhaps this matter might be investigated by that Committee. The expenditure he had pointed out ought to be upon the Estimates for the year, and as it was not it was just possible it might be excluded from the purview of such a Committee.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) said, that the several points raised by the hon. Member were quite susceptible of explanation. The hon. Member had made this subject his own, and had, indeed, made it an annual Motion. [MR. LABOUCHERE: I never brought it forward before in my life.] It would be annual. However, he had not the smallest fault to find with the manner in which the subject had been brought forward. As to the donations to churches and schools, the Treasury must accept the responsibility for them. The principle on which they were made was that those who managed the property recognized as devolving upon them the same duties and responsibilities as were generally recognized by private landowners, and on this ground it had always been the custom to contribute to the erection of churches and schools on the estates. This might or might not be wrong, but it was the custom. Much of the expenditure on Windsor Park was incurred in the maintenance of roads and in other expenses of like character, about which there could hardly be much question. With regard to the suggestion which really was the core of the hon. Member's speech—if there was any core in it at all—it would be obvious that he was not in a position, in the first place, to remark upon a Commission which had not yet been introduced to the House. It appeared, however, that the hon. Gentleman had got some information that a Commission was to be appointed to inquire into the great spending Departments. Although, for his part, he had no knowledge on the subject, he would say that he thought that such an inquiry as had been suggested by the hon. Member might very properly be undertaken by the Members of that Commission. Further than that he would only say—and he did not say it as a mere matter of form—that in consequence of what the hon. Gentleman had said he would endeavour to make himself acquainted with the details of that particular office; and if he found the facts to be as the hon. Member had stated them he would endeavour to effect some improvement. He hoped the House would now be allowed to go into Committee.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said, he felt bound to say, having recently held the Office which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jackson) now held, that he was very pleased to hear an inquiry would be granted into the management of the Woods and Forests, because he believed it to be absolutely necessary in order to bring about effective Parliamentary control over the current expenditure of that Department. The Committee would be asked to vote £30,000 for this Department; but that by no means represented the expenditure, which would be much greater, and there were some very serious items in connection with the Crown lands. As a matter of fact this Department had borrowed between £200,000 and £300,000. He thought the House would agree that there should be an effective inquiry with a view to reducing the cost of management and increasing—as he was sure it could be increased—the income of that Department. He had himself intended next Session to move for the appointment of a Committee on the subject; but if the hon. Member thought the work could be better done by the Commission he had nothing to say.

Mr. PYNE (Waterford, W.) said, he thought that the Constabulary had been employed unnecessarily in very many cases. He knew of a gentleman who had got himself "Boycotted," and then applied for police protection, his object being to become a stipendiary magistrate. That gentleman was himself a tenant, and while he was extorting his rents from his own tenants he did not pay his own rent. He made an arrangement with his landlady, and subsequently became a bankrupt; so that his landlady got no rent. That was the sort of men the police were protecting. The hon. Member also referred to his own imprisonment for using his influence with the people to protect his landlord.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter to which the hon. Gentleman is now referring has no relation to the Constabulary Vote.

Mr. PYNE said, he was alluding to evictions by the police, and what he would do in case it was proposed to evict him. He was intimating that it would take more than one policeman to turn him out. He had a very great respect for the Police Force themselves; but it was well known that the police behaved in the most arbitrary manner when engaged in suppressing prohibited meetings. He denounced the employment of constables as spies. One such, in his own part of the country, was relieved of the trammels of discipline in consideration of his labours in this direction, and was in the habit of coming to the barracks late at night and drunk. When asked where he got his drink from the reply was that he had been getting information. Those were the men to whom he objected.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid), who was called to Order for irrelevancy, complained of the way in which the Constabulary were utilized in Ireland. They were employed to extract rack rents for the benefit of extravagant landlords living in London under the control of Jews. The Constabulary were used really by the classes against the masses. He hoped that the two democracies of England and Ireland would be enabled to say that the police would no longer act in this outrageous way in carrying out unjust evictions against an unfortunate people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The remarks of the hon. Member have nothing whatever to do with the Constabulary.

Dr. TANNER: Of course, Sir, I bow to your ruling. I do not wish in any way to go outside the subject which has been brought on for discussion. I was trying as far as possible to confine my remarks to the employment of the police in evicting Irish tenants.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.) rose to call attention to an item in the Estimates——

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): I rise to Order. After the ruling you have already given, I submit that the hon. Member is not in Order in discussing, in detail, the items which appear in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member in taking that course would be altogether out of Order, on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £9,931, to complete the sum for Royal University, Ireland, Buildings.

(2.) £17,000, to complete the sum for Science and Art Buildings, Dublin.

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

(3.) Motion made and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £15,978, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords."

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I have an Amendment to move on this Vote. The object of it is this—there are certain officers in the House of Lords who perform similar duties to those which are performed by the officers of this House, and who ought to have equal salaries to the officers of the House of Commons. I am not raising the question whether any of these salaries are too high or too low. I know that it is not open to any private Member to move that any salaries shall be raised. I am not prepared to say that the gentlemen who sit in the House of Lords ought not even to have their salaries raised; but I do maintain that our officers ought to have equal salaries to the officers of the House of Lords. As a matter of fact, I am of opinion myself that they ought to have a good deal more; but, taking a mild and temperate view of the matter, I say that, at any rate, they ought to have the same. The four officers whose salaries I propose to reduce are the Clerk of the Parliaments, the Clerk Assistant, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, and the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod. I have divided them into two separate Amendments; but perhaps it will be more convenient that I should move both Amendments together. As to the Clerk of the Parliaments, we know very well that an abominable job was committed by the Tory Government last year. It will be in the recollection of the Committee that there was a vacancy in the office of Clerk of the Parliaments, who is the principal officer of those who sit at the Table of the House of Lords; and it was assumed that Sir Thomas Erskine May, who was the gentleman best adapted for the office, would be appointed. All that Sir Thomas Erskine May had to plead in his favour was his unrivalled fitness for the office, and the fact that he had passed his life in the service of the House of Commons. Another gentleman, however, was appointed, who, as far as I can make out, had passed his life in some office in a lunatic asylum. but who had the superior qualification of being a relative of a noble Lord who was a Member of the Conservative Ministry. That fact would, of course, outweigh any actual services rendered to either House of Parliament. I am not complaining in particular of the Conservative Government, because, if a Liberal Ministry had been in Office, it would probably have been one of their cousins. Indeed, I cannot venture to say which of the two Parties has committed the greatest number of jobs. At any rate, this particular appointment was a rather strong measure; but I will not allude to it further. I have only felt it my duty to mention it incidentally. What I submit is that officers who are here from 10 to 12 and 14 hours a-day ought to have at least salaries equivalent to the officers of the House of Lords, who sit for an hour or two, and only very occasionally later than 8 o'clock. I propose to move the reduction of the salary of the Clerk of the Parliaments by £500, of the Clerk Assistant by £200, of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod by £800, and of the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod by £200. Those sums make £1,700 altogether, and I therefore move that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £1,700.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £14,278, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the House of Lords."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The Amendment moved by the hon. Member combines two different questions. It is a kind of censure on the appointment of Mr. Graham as Clerk of the Parliaments—[Mr. LABOUCHERE: Not the Amendment.] It combines a stricture upon the appointment of Mr. Graham in the last Parliament, and it also alludes to the disparity, in point of salary, between the officers of the House of Commons and those of the House of Lords. As to the latter, I will only say it is a subject which, for a very long time, has attracted the attention of the public, owing to the saying and doings of the hon. Member and those who agree with him—namely, the question of the salaries of the officers of the House of Lords. But with regard to the appointment of Mr. Graham, I have to state, in the first place, that it chiefly concerns the House of Lords, of which he is the principal officer. Therefore, if it is open to the strictures, criticism, and condemnation passed upon it by the hon. Member and many others who have openly expressed their condemnation, it stands to reason that Members of the House of Lords in the position of Lord Granville, Lord Kimberley, or Lord Rosebery, who, if the hon. Member will pardon me for saying so, are quite as good judges as he—[Mr. LABOUCHERE: No!]—quite as good judges of the interests of the Public Service, and with far more experience as far as regards the House of Lords—it stands, then, to reason that they would have stood up and condemned the appointment. But nothing of the kind has taken place, and the House of Lords has shown itself perfectly satisfied with the appointment made by the First Lord of the Treasury of that day, and not a word was said by us calculated to throw a slur upon the appointment of Mr. Graham. Therefore, I maintain that as the House of Lords, who are the persons principally interested in the matter of the appointment of their own chief officer, there is certainly a *primâ facie* ground for no interference, on the part of the hon. Member or of this House, with the appointment. And now let me come to the appointment itself. The hon. Member, with that extraordinary freedom of language which he alone of all English Members allows himself to use, characterizes the appointment as an "abominable job." I ask the House to realize what such an expression means. It means that Lord Salisbury, who is responsible for the appointment, has been actuated by the most disgraceful and corrupt motives. [*Cries of* "No!"] I maintain either that the words mean something, or that they do not. I assume that when a Member of this House characterizes an appointment to an important office as an "abominable job," he distinctly means to bring a charge which is to carry with it the imputation of disgraceful, abominable, and corrupt motives on the part of the persons responsible for the appointment. Otherwise, the hon. Member stands convicted of using language in this House to which he attaches no importance whatever. The hon. Gentleman went on to say that Mr. Graham had passed his life in a lunatic asylum. I suppose he thought that a very humorous and witty way of describing the fact that Mr. Graham had been a Master in Lunacy. That is the way in which the hon. Member has thought it consistent with the dignity of this House and his own position to describe a gentleman who has for some considerable time faithfully served the public. He went on to say that Mr. Graham was appointed because he was a relation of Lord Cranbrook. That is an insinuation I decline to notice. It appears to be based upon the gossip-mongering and scandal in which the hon. Member, in his capacity as a society journalist, takes a warm and professional interest. And now let me see what were Mr. Graham's qualifications, dropping all the license and exaggeration of the hon. Member for Northampton. Mr. Henry Graham was for six years principal Private Secretary to Lord Cairns. Lord Cairns, during two of those years, was Lord Chancellor of England, and I do not think that, on the whole record and roll of Lord Chancellors, there has been a name more illustrious. Lord Cairns was essentially a man who required a first-rate Private Secretary, and his Private Secretary must, in the course of six years, have acquired a most intimate knowledge of the working and work of the House of Lords. For six years Mr. Graham served Lord Cairns, and assisted him not only in the work which would fall to the Lord Chancellor as Speaker of the House of Lords, but also in the most important work which falls to the Lord Chancellor as presiding over the Appellate Tribunal of the House of Lords. Lord Cairn's Secretary was able, during those six years, to obtain a thorough mastery over all the Judicial Business of the House of Lords. If that is not an important qualification for the post of Chief Clerk in the House of Lords, I am really at a loss to know what would be a qualification. The hon. Member made it a ground of complaint that Sir Erskine May—the late Lord Farnborough—whose loss we all deeply deplore, had not been promoted to the vacancy. I am not at present concerned to discuss the reason why that promotion did not take place, or the exercise of the discretion of the Prime Minister in not appointing him. But is the hon. Member aware that there is no precedent for the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons being appointed Clerk of the Parliaments in the House of Lords? It does not at all follow that experience in the work of the House of Commons is an evidence of qualification for work in the House of Lords. The work of the House of Lords is totally different, especially the judicial work. The hon. Member assumed that Mr. Graham was appointed solely because he was Private Secretary to Lord Cairns, and seemed to think that his position as Private Secretary to Lord Cairns was a disqualification rather than a qualification. The hon. Member amuses himself by writing every week in *The Daily News*, or in that other journal with which he is connected, panegyrics on the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and by dooming to ostracism from the ranks of the Liberal Party everybody who presumes to differ from the right hon. Gentleman. Well, I will read an extract from a speech of that right hon. Gentleman which bears upon this subject, and I read it with the more interest because the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman were made in answer to observations coming from myself. On a former occasion, the right hon. Gentleman, with reference to an appointment in the Customs out of the regular course, used these words, and I commend them to the notice of the hon. Member—

> "I shall contend that such appointments—appointments of Private Secretaries—although in some cases they may be bad, have in many cases been the best that could be made. There have been many men prominent in the Public Service who have been Private Secretaries. There can be no other relation in political life which gives such knowledge of the capacities of a man as the relation of Private Secretary. I shall not hesitate to affirm, with regard to such offices, that they require qualifications which have often sufficed for the creditable discharge of political functions. In two cases I have appointed Private Secretaries. One of them was Mr. West, whose capacity has been tested by those who differed from him in politics; the other was Mr. Godley, than whom no person has more distinguished himself."

That was the right hon. Gentleman's opinion as to the appointment of Private Secretaries, and so freely did he act upon it that the House will be surprised to learn the number of Private Secretaries the right hon. Gentleman appointed to high offices. Mr. Ryan, Private Secretary to Mr. Gladstone, was appointed Comptroller and Auditor General; Mr. West (now Sir Algernon West), Private Secretary to Mr. Gladstone, was appointed Chairman to the Board of Inland Revenue; Mr. Godley, also Private Secretary to Mr. Gladstone, was first appointed to a Commissionership of Inland Revenue, and then to the permanent Under Secretaryship of India; Mr. Horace Seymour, Private Secretary to Mr. Gladstone, was appointed permanent Commissioner of Customs at a salary of £1,200 a-year; and only the other day Mr. Primrose, Mr. Gladstone's last Private Secretary, was appointed to the lucrative and delightful post of permanent Assistant Commissioner of Works. In the appointments made by other Liberal Cabinet Ministers I find that Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, who was Mr. Lowe's Private Secretary, was appointed Controller of the National Debt; and that Mr. Milford, Sir William Harcourt's Private Secretary, was appointed permanent Secretary to the Office of Works. I do not blame the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian nor his Colleagues for having made these appointments; but it is certainly a long list of appointments of great importance which are looked upon as great prizes in the Civil Service, and which have been given—and rightly given—to the Private Secretaries of the right hon. Gentlemen and his Colleagues. Therefore, I decline altogether to entertain for one moment any accusation that may be brought against Lord Salisbury for appointing to an office in the House of Lords a man who had served Lord Cairns as Private Secretary for six years. The appointment of Mr. Graham has been approved by the House of Lords, who are primarily concerned, and it cannot, in any degree, be censured as a political job. Lord Salisbury singled out the man who was, by his qualifications and experience, fitted in every way to fill the office; and the persons whose comfort and convenience are mainly interested have expressed themselves thoroughly satisfied with the way in which Mr. Graham has discharged his duties. So much for this "abominable job." I now come to the question of the alleged disparity between the salaries of the officers of the House of Lords and of the officers of the House of Commons. It is not the case that there is a great disparity between the salaries of the Clerk of the Parliaments and of the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons. The salary of the latter is £2,000 a-year, in addition to £200 a-year as Secretary to the Caledonian Canal Commissioners. [An hon. MEMBER: No!] Then the information which has been furnished to me appears to be wrong. The salary of the Clerk of the House of Commons, then, is £2,000 a-year; he has an official residence provided for him; furniture is given to him; lighting and firing are provided for him; and he does not have to pay rates and taxes. These privileges are worth from £800 to £1,000 a-year. The Clerk of the Parliaments has a salary of £2,500 a-year, with £500 as an allowance in lieu of an official residence. Therefore, in respect of the salaries of the two officials there is no great difference. The duties of the Clerk of the Parliaments and of the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons are, to a certain extent, different. The duties of the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons, it is true, are very heavy while the House is sitting. There is a great deal of night work, which must be very trying. But it must be remembered that the Clerk of the Parliaments has duties to perform as registrar of the appellate tribunal of the House of Lords. Although he has not the night work to do which falls to the Clerk of the House of Commons, he is employed for a much longer period annually. He has to remain at his post from November until the commencement of the Long Vacation. Balancing the circumstances of the two offices, therefore, there seems to be no great disparity between them. The hon. Member alluded also to certain other officials—to the Second Clerk, to the Usher of the Black Rod, and the Yeoman Usher. Many Members of this House may not be aware of the fact that until 1869—and to this I would direct their attention—that up to the year 1869 the salaries and expenses of the officials of the House of Lords were mainly defrayed out of the fees paid in connection with Private Bills or arising from forfeiture. The deficiency, when any occurred between the amount of the fees and the expenditure of the House of Lords, was made good by the House of Commons each year. Until 1869 the House of Lords defrayed all its expenses, to the amount of £36,900 a-year, and only came to the House of Commons for £8,300, the total expenses of the House of Lords having been £45,200. In that year the House of Lords surrendered all its fees to the Exchequer, on the condition that the House of Commons should vote a sufficient sum for its expenses. From that time the expenses, which, in 1867, were £47,000, have diminished until, in the year 1886, they came to £46,000—a diminution of £1,000 a-year; and, moreover, the sum of at least £1,000 is invariably saved in the Vote granted by the House of Commons. Therefore, the actual expenses of the House of Lords have diminished, since they gave up their fees to the Exchequer, by no less a sum than £2,000 a-year. But that does not represent anything like the profit which the House of Commons makes. In the course of the year 1877, when Sir Augustus Clifford, the then Usher of the Black Rod, died, a sum of £2,000 came upon the Votes. But the salary and fees of the Usher of the Black Rod amounted, in 1869, to no less a sum than £4,000 a-year; so that the Treasury, by the bargain which was made in that year with the House of Lords with regard to this particular office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, have made a clear profit of £2,000 a-year. Instead of £4,000 a-year, the Usher of the Black Rod has only now £2,000 a-year, and the balance goes into the Exchequer. If, then, you take the £2,000 a-year which the House gained by the arrangement arrived at in 1869, and the £2,000 a-year gained in connection with the office of Black Rod, you get a resulting profit of £4,000 a-year from the House of Lords having given up its fees to the Exchequer. I do not think these facts are below the notice of the hon. Member, and of those who look upon the House of Lords as an Establishment which is going to be immediately abolished, and as one which reflects discredit on the country. But if that is the motive of the hon. Member in moving this Amendment, I will only say to him, and to those who support him, in the words used by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian at the commencement of this Session, in reply to the hon. Member's Colleague the other Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh)—"If you want to attack the House of Lords, or abolish the House of Lords, bring up your proposition boldly, and let the House of Commons and the country decide upon it;" but do not in this petty, niggardly, and underhand fashion lay down an insidious line of attack against the House of Lords and attempt to deprive it of the money which is absolutely necessary to enable it to discharge its functions as a Legislative Assembly and judicial tribunal. Bring up your proposition, and let us see whether Parliament is in favour of abolishing the House of Lords. But, until that moment arrives, let the hon. Member have sufficient generosity and chivalry to admit that the House of Lords is an Establishment that must be maintained in a certain amount of dignity and comfort, and not to attempt to deprive it of money which is necessary to enable it to discharge its functions with efficiency. I have shown that the House of Lords has given up to the House of Commons, from revenue which was its own, and absolutely under its own control, a sum of £40,000 a-year—all its fees were placed in charge of the House of Commons on the condition that the House of Commons should then undertake all the expenses of the House of Lords. Now I come to another matter. I am of opinion that the general sense of Parliament and the people is that the time has come when all our public Establishments might advantageously be examined into and reviewed; and it is quite possible that the Houses of Parliament will be found among the first of the public Establishments of the country which will usefully bear examination and inquiry. The proposal that I would be inclined to make to the House is this. That next Session there should be a Joint Committee appointed—a small Joint Committee of certainly not less than, and perhaps not more than, three Members of both Houses, who should examine into the Establishments of both Houses jointly—so that the knowledge acquired in the House of Commons may be applied to the House of Lords, and the knowledge acquired in the House of Lords may be brought to bear on the Establishment of the House of Commons. One matter which would be inquired into and reported upon would be the cost of each House. That is a procedure which I think might result in a considerable diminution of the Establishment charges. This would especially be the case if the Committee included within the scope of its inquiry the subject of Private Bill legislation. If that inquiry is undertaken with a view to diminish the duties which fall on Parliament in connection with Private Bill legislation, I think it is possible that the charges of both Houses might be very considerably diminished. What I want to impress on the House of Commons is this—that those who indulge in criticisms of the Establishment of the House of Lords, and the officials of the House of Lords, ought to remember that they live in a glass house. It is, of course, possible that the Establishment of the House of Lords may admit of reduction; but the same remark applies equally to the House of Commons. At the present moment there is no doubt that it is the bounden duty of the House of Commons to vote the reasonable demands of the House of Lords for its efficient maintenance, and I am sure that the groundless Motion of the hon. Member for

Northampton will be repudiated by a large majority.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): In speaking upon this subject I will not go into the comparative importance or license implied in the use of the word "underhand," as applied to the Motion of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) for reducing the expenditure of the House of Lords. I think the hon. Member deserves the gratitude of the country for raising the question, and I believe that he has occupied the time of the Committee with advantage. I certainly failed to see anything in the remarks of the hon. Member to justify the severe censure of the noble Lord. The hon. Member has made no underhand attack upon the House of Lords. His proposition is simply to place the two Houses of Parliament on a footing of equality, and to save the money of the taxpayers, which is one of the most laudable functions of a Member of this House. The purpose for which I have risen now is to protest against the appointment of a Joint Committee. I do not care whether there are three Peers on it, or 15, or 20; but I altogether object to the proposal to select three Members of the House of Commons for the performance of these functions. May I ask if it is intended that one of them should be an Irish Member?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that the discussion is straying away from the Amendment. The hon. and gallant Member cannot discuss the appointment of a Committee which has been merely foreshadowed by the noble Lord.

COLONEL NOLAN: I have no wish to discuss the appointment of the three eminent Members of the Committee further. I only wanted to suggest that each of these three eminent Gentlemen would probably have a Private Secretary, and that I think is strictly in accordance with the argument of the noble Lord. The fact of having three Private Secretaries to appoint might probably influence the action in the matter of noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen who have been Cabinet Ministers and of those who hope to be Cabinet Ministers. After the panegyric which has been pronounced by the noble Lord on Private Secretaries, I think there is likely to be a tremendous rush for the appointment. We have had a most formidable list of appointments read out; but although it consists of appointments made on the Liberal side, I think it is quite probable that an equally important list could be given of appointments on the Conservative side. As the rule, I have not seen that Conservatives have been in the habit of treating their friends worse than the Liberals, and I should say that the prizes in the Civil Service have been applied in rewarding handsomely the devotion of Private Secretaries. There was one part of the noble Lord's speech which I think was chiefly conspicuous and important from its omissions, and that is, that he took no notice whatever of the object which the hon. Member for Northampton has in view—not separation on the part of the House of Commons, but complete equality with the House of Lords. Why should there be these extra payments to the officials of the House of Lords, because extra payments they are, wrap them up as you may? In short, the officers of the House of Lords are paid at a much higher rate than those of the House of Commons. Why should we submit to that inequality? Why should the House of Lords, with better appointments, claim from that fact a superior position for the Upper Chamber? That is the strongest reason why I support the hon. Member in his proposal to reduce the Vote. I think we are extremely good to the House of Lords, who represent nobody but themselves, to allow them equality; but if we consent to establish their superiority we deserve to be regarded as their inferiors. There was one argument used by the noble Lord which is altogether fallacious. He said that the House of Lords have given up fees to the extent of £47,000 a-year, and therefore we are bound, in ordinary justice, to find them the money. Now, if the House of Lords had given up £47,000 a-year out of their private property, there really might be something in the argument of the noble Lord. But what was it that they really did? They had been imposing taxes on the suitors, and those fees are now paid into the Exchequer, and it is a very ordinary kind of reform indeed that such fees should be paid into a common fund. The Attorney General for Ireland used to be paid in the same way, £2,000 a year, out of the Patent Fund; but because he surrendered it, are we in future to have no control over his salary? The argument of the noble Lord amounts to this—that the House of Lords has a vested interest and private property in these fees, which are wrung from the persons who go to them for justice. This £47,000 was a mere matter of account. The House of Commons of that day took a proper view of the importance of the matter, and insisted on there being one fund under the control of the Exchequer. This is not a very new Motion; it has often been brought forward before. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] I hear hon. Gentlemen opposite say "Divide!" but if there is any attempt to control the discussion of the Estimates, I, for one, shall not feel inclined to submit to it, and shall feel it my duty to speak on every Vote. At present we are engaged in an attempt to save the money of the taxpayers, and if in doing so we are to be cried down by the Conservative side of the House, it is our duty to assert ourselves and endeavour to effect these economies. I do not think the country will accept the principle of the noble Lord—that the officers of the House of Lords ought to be paid more than those of the House of Commons. I think that the hon. Member for Northampton, instead of deserving the severe censure which has been showered on his head by the noble Lord, deserves the gratitude of the whole country for bringing forward the question in the way he has done. The noble Lord tells us that, after a service of six years as Private Secretary, a gentleman was placed in a post to which a salary of £3,000 a year is attached; whereas there are Clerks at the Table of this House who have served for 14 years with nothing like an equivalent. I do not say that this appointment is worse than that of other Private Secretaries, but I think the hon. Member is right in the course he has taken.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I always admired the ability of the noble Lord in dealing with difficult questions, and the admirable manner in which he skates over the thin ice, as in this case, and puts before the Committee two or three issues altogether distinct from those which have been raised. I do not propose to follow him into his defence of the appointment of Mr. Graham as Clerk of the Parliaments. All I will say in regard to the doctrine that the House of Lords are the only judges of the exercise of the patronage of the Prime Minister, is, that the Prime Minister is responsible for the exercise of that patronage to the House of Commons as well as to the House of Lords. But it is a mistake to rest the matter upon the merits or demerits of Mr. Graham. Everyone agrees that if Sir Erskine May had lived, he would have been the most competent person to fill that office. But Sir Erskine May has gone, and I am not prepared to say that Mr. Graham is disqualified or incompetent to perform the duties. I am sure that in reading out the list of Private Secretaries promoted by the late Prime Minister, the noble Lord forgot to state that every one of those gentlemen, before he became Private Secretary, was already a distinguished member of the Civil Service, and merely won a legitimate prize of his own profession. The grave question is the startling discrepancy in the salaries paid to officials for doing the same work in the two Houses of Parliament. The noble Lord attempted two or three defences of these discrepancies. The first was, that there was, in reality, no discrepancy at all; but the fact remains that the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons is paid £2,000 a-year, and has an official residence, whereas the Chief Clerk of the House of Lords is paid £2,500 a-year, and is allowed £500 a-year for an official residence. Therefore, for all practical purposes, there is a difference of £500 a-year between the two. With reference to the work, it is perfectly idle to compare the two. The House of Lords sits barely for three weeks in the month of November as an appellate tribunal. Pile it up over and over again, as you like, it is ridiculous to say that the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons, and the Clerks at the Table, do not perform as much work in one month as the Clerks of the House of Lords do in 12 months. I have no wish to place the House of Lords below the level of the House of Commons, but I support the proposition that the officers of both Houses should be placed on a level. Take another office—that of Usher of the Black Rod. Compare the duties of that office with those of our Serjeant-at-Arms. Yet the Sergeant-at-Arms gets £1,200 a-year, and an official residence, while the Black Rod has

£2,000 and an official residence, together with emoluments as an Admiral on the Retired List, and fees for his own use as an officer of the Order of the Garter. I do not mean to contend that Black Rod should be paid less than the Serjeant-at-Arms; but the fact is patent to everybody that the work which the Serjeant-at-Arms has to do is very much heavier than that of Black Rod. "But," says the noble Lord, "Sir Augustus Clifford received a large sum in fees, and when the office became vacant, those fees were given up to the Treasury." I venture to say there was no officer who was not originally paid by fees. The Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Lord Chancellor, and the Judges, were all paid by fees; but, after considering what the future remuneration of various officers should be when a new appointment was made, the Treasury received the fee and the person appointed was paid a salary. The Lord Chancellor now gets £10,000 a-year; but the fees in Lord Eldon's time amounted to as much as £27,000 a-year. It is a stock phrase in all these debates on the discrepancy of the salaries paid to the officers of the two Houses, that the Lords surrendered up a large amount of fees into the control of the House of Commons, out of which it previously paid its officials. That is true, and it is not true. The House of Lords did not pay its officers out of fees exclusively, but it had to come to the House of Commons for a Vote. If hon. Members will look at the Papers placed before them, they will see that the estimated receipts from the House of Lords are £26,000 only, while the requirements are £46,000, and, that being admitted, it is clear the House of Commons has a right to discuss and control the expenditure of that £20,000. The fees paid by the suitors — paid by the public for exercising their rights in one of the tribunals of the country; and, as a matter of fact, the House of Lords' fees do not cover the House of Lords' expenditure by something like £20,000. The simple issue upon which the Committee is now called to express its opinion is, whether the servants of the two Houses, without going into the question of the amount of work, should, as between the two Houses, be paid at the same rate. I think the noble Lord practically admitted before he sat down his own dissatisfaction with his own argument, because he said that the time has arrived, and I quite agree with him, for a regular overhauling of our spending Departments, and he threw out a hint that he was prepared to concede that the expenditure of the two Houses should be subjected to an inquiry of that sort. The Secretary to the Treasury also said, a short time ago, in reference to the Woods and Forests, that he was disposed to look favourably on the suggestion that the forthcoming Commission should embrace an inquiry into those two Departments. I think that suggestion was readily accepted by the House; but, I venture to think that it is not desirable to let a Joint Committee of both Houses determine questions which belong Constitutionally to the House of Commons. The House of Commons alone has control over the Expenditure of the country, and we must be careful how we admit even the thinnest end of the wedge. The noble Lord has a full right to discuss how such an inquiry should be carried out—that is only a fair and reasonable proposition; but as far as the general principle is concerned, I cannot for one moment see, as between the two Houses, why the Chief Clerks, the Black Rod, and the Serjeant-at-Arms, and every other official, no matter what position he occupies, should not be paid the same level sums. Without raising the question of the work itself, I see nothing in the work done by the Clerk of the Parliaments in the House of Lords to justify the payment of that officer at a higher rate than the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I wish to point out that the right hon. Gentleman has not carried his argument quite far enough. It would seem to be a long time since the right hon. Gentleman visited the House of Lords, or he would be aware that there is absolute inequality between the two Houses. Indeed, there is a shocking inequality between ourselves and the House of Lords—an inequality that fills me with shame and humiliation as a Member of the House of Commons. Hon. Members will have noticed that the staircase descending from the House of Lords is carpeted; our staircase has no carpet. The right hon. Gentleman will have observed that at the corners of that staircase there are magnificent attendants, dressed in scarlet and gold; we have no attendants dressed in scarlet and gold. If the right hon. Gentleman goes into the House of Lords itself, he will see that the benches are far more comfortable than ours, and that they are covered with scarlet leather. It must be perfectly shocking and humiliating to a patriot to observe all the marks of inequality between the two Houses. Therefore, the argument of the right hon. Gentleman is worth nothing, unless he is prepared to go further, and sweep away and abolish for ever these inequalities, or anything that might lead the public to suppose that this House is in any way inferior to the House of Lords. The whole idea itself of the House of Lords—and you may abolish it if you like, or if you can—is to surround it with far more of pomp and state and circumstance than the House of Commons. All the pomp and state and circumstance which surround the Throne and the administration of justice is centred in the House of Lords. If you want to alter the character of the House of Lords, by all means do so if you can; but to say that all things are to be placed on a footing of equality, when there is no parity whatever between them, is absurd. It falls entirely to the ground, unless you are prepared to change the whole character of that Institution, and to make it nothing but what the right hon. Gentleman would probably like to see it—an Elective Senate, like that of the United States of America.

MR. BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): It is very difficult to know where to have the noble Lord; we have now had two speeches from him. In the first speech he argued that the House of Lords was entirely on an equality with the House of Commons as to salaries and everything else; and now he comes down upon my right hon. Friend the Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. Henry H. Fowler), and says the social inequality between the two Houses is so great, that it must of necessity extend to the salaries also. I do not propose to enter into the question which has occupied a large share of the speech of the noble Lord—namely, the appointment of Mr. Graham. I am not one of those who are anxious to scent a job in every appointment, and I believe that both sides of the House are actuated by a very high sense of the requirements of the Public Service, and that these accusations of jobbery on both sides are, in 99 cases out of 100, without the slightest foundation. On the question of the actual salaries between the House of Lords and the House of Commons, I think the noble Lord made out a pretty strong case as between the salary of the Chief Clerk in the House of Lords and the Chief Clerk here; but I would point out this fact in reference to the salary of the Assistant Clerk of the House of Lords, which is included in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), that the Second Clerk of the Upper House receives a salary of £1,800 a year, and £300 for a house; while the Second Clerk in this House only receives £1,500 a year, and no allowance for a house. And surely this is an office in regard to which it cannot be said that the work of the Clerk in this House is not as great or very much greater than that of the Clerk of the Upper House. That is one of the points on which the Committee are asked to vote, and it is one on which we hope to obtain something more approaching to economy than we have at present.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to ask an explanation from the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, of the reason why two Irish Votes, upon which I was anxious to make some remarks—that is to say, the Votes for University Buildings, and for Science and Art Buildings in Dublin, were taken at the commencement of the proceedings in Committee? I believed that the Votes would be taken in order; but, to my astonishment, I find that a considerable space in the Estimates have been passed over, and these two Votes taken.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I am sorry that the hon. Member has been disappointed in his wish to speak on the Votes referred to; but it would be a very hard thing to blame the Government for asking money for Ireland. The simple explanation, however, is that two Votes, one for £25,000 for the new Admiralty and War Office, and the other for £800 for Dover Harbour, have not been brought forward, because Her Majesty's Government have decided not to spend the money this year. The two

Irish Votes were, therefore, taken in their order.

Mr. DILLON: The explanation of the noble Lord is so unsatisfactory that I must say I think it would have been better to have appended a note to the Paper for our instruction. The Paper appears to show that the Votes referred to by the noble Lord would be taken.

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): As I am technically responsible for this, I beg to assure the hon. Gentleman that there was not the slighest intention to mislead the Committee. The fact is, as the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer has stated, these two sums of £25,000 and £800 which appear on the Estimates were not wanted this year, and therefore, following the usual course, they were passed over.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 98; Noes 173: Majority 75. — (Div. List, No. 17.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): I wish to draw attention to the question of the salary of the Librarian of the House of Commons. His salary is not as large as that of the Librarian of the House of Lords, but we must agree that he does ten times as much work. I think also that it is unfair that the Librarian of the House of Lords should have a residence provided for him, while our Librarian has no residence. We must all acknowledge that we receive every attention from all the gentlemen in the Library when we require their services; and I believe that it is not too much to say that a gentleman who is kept here until 3 o'clock in the morning might more reasonably expect a residence than the gentleman who occupies a similar position in another House and who does not remain until so late an hour. This question was raised in a previous Parliament; there was then a strong minority in favour of it—of a residence being provided for our Librarian. I think it must be acknowledged by hon. Members in every quarter of the House that this gentleman performs more important duties in connection with this House than does the Librarian of the House of Lords in connection with that Chamber. I shall be glad to hear the remarks which the Government have to make on this matter.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness): The noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill), in some of his remarks on the last Vote, was, I think, hardly in Order in speaking of the decorations of the House of Lords. There may be carpets, and there may be red morocco leather, as well as other extravagances in the House of Lords; but as they do not appear in the Vote, we cannot properly discuss them. However, the noble Lord, in common with those hon. Members who object to the political action of the House of Lords, should have the courage of his convictions and vote against the whole sum. I think the House of Lords uses its powers in a way in which it ought not to use them, and I would call the attention of the hon. Gentlemen opposite to one of the last things done in the House of Lords last year.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman should recollect that criticisms on the political action of the House of Lords would be out of place on this Vote; but the hon. Member will be quite in Order if he speaks against the Vote as a whole.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Edinburgh, W.): I have one question to ask with regard to this Vote. The Committee will be aware that the opening of the House of Lords and the House of Commons to the public on Saturdays is under the control of the Lord Great Chamberlain. There has been a strong feeling that the House of Commons might now be again thrown open to visitors on Saturdays. Although Members of the House of Commons, some time ago, were in favour of opening the House to the public, yet it was discovered that this official, the Lord Great Chamberlain, had it in his power to prevent it. I think the time has arrived when the House of Commons might again be thrown open to visitors on Saturdays, and I shall be glad if the noble Lord the Leader of the House would make a representation to the Lord Great Chamberlain to that effect.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I think, if the hon. Member will take into consideration the circumstance that the Lord Great Chamberlain was for many years a popular Member of this

House, he may be assured that that official will not put any obstacle unnecessarily in the way of the public having access to the House of Commons, and I am sure he will find, if he inquires, that any arrangement with regard to the admission of the public to the Palace of Westminster has been made entirely in accordance with the Police Regulations which it became necessary to impose after the outrages which occurred two or three years ago.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £22,493, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): On this Vote I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to some items which appear under Sub-head III., page 90, with respect to the salaries of the Clerks of the House. Now, one would have supposed that in the House of Commons, the House of the Representatives of the people, there would be as much free and open competition for appointments as there is in other Departments of the Service. But this is not the case. There are four principal Clerks, whose salaries go from £850 to £1,000, and seven senior Clerks, at salaries from £650 to £800. I make no objection to the salaries, and have no doubt that the gentlemen who receive them are worthy of the money paid for their services. It is, of course, necessary to have gentlemen of a certain social position to fill places of this kind; but I do not know that the qualifications of gentlemen for these posts are higher or in any way better than the qualifications of men in the Foreign Office, Colonial Office, in the Admiralty, and War Office, and other Departments of Secretaries of State. But whereas, some few years ago, all the clerkships in these superior Offices were thrown open to competition, here, in the House of Commons, these appointments are reserved for the direct, or all but direct, nomination of an official of the House. Recently the position has been somewhat modified and explained by a letter which was laid before the House a few days ago from the Clerk of the House to Mr. Horace Mann, Secretary to the Civil Service Commissioners, to the effect that he informed the Commissioners that it was his intention, while remaining responsible for the appointment of clerks to the House of Commons, to make such appointments depend on the result of competitive examination among such candidates as he might nominate for the positions, and that subjoined was a schedule showing the subjects of examination to which candidates would be subjected. The schedule is as follows:—Handwriting and orthography; power of accurately perusing, connected with original documents; arithmetic, including vulgar and decimal fractions; English composition; history of England from 1603 to 1860; Constitutional history of England as gathered from four text-books; and, finally, Latin. The schedule goes on to say that for qualification, translation from Latin to English will be required, but marks will be given for translation from English to Latin. Now that is the standard of examination to which are to be subjected a very small number of gentlemen nominated by the Clerk of the House. I say that to fill up the staff of Clerks of the House of Commons in such a way as this, when positions in all other important Offices of State are open to the public by free competition, is to reserve to this House, which is the House of the people, a system of exclusiveness that ought not to continue. It is not to be contended that, in point of examination, there is any particular reason why the men in the Admiralty or the War Office should be superior to the clerks in the House of Commons, and yet the examination required to be passed by the clerks in the Department of the Clerk of the House is radically inferior to that to which persons competing for appointments in the Offices of the Secretaries of State are subjected. I do not want to move any reduction of this Vote, and yet I ask the Committee to consider the evident unfairness of reserving to a small number of men—the personal friends, possibly, of the Clerk of the House, or the friends of his friends—appointments which, as regards their financial remuneration, are so very much superior to those other appointments in the Civil Service open to competition, but the securing of which is so very much more difficult. If you require men who ought to be paid these large sums, then you ought to get the very best men as tested by the recognized system of examination; and you ought to have these posts in connection with the House of Commons as much open to competition amongst the great body of the people as the posts in all the Offices of the Secretaries of State and other Departments of the Public Service. The pay of these gentlemen is very much higher than the pay of any other persons who have to submit to so small an examination as that I have described. I stated that recently the position has been somewhat modified. Formerly it was more exclusive than it is now; there has been, to a certain extent, a yielding of ground. But what is the effect? The effect is small. It may appear paradoxical, as a rule, to extend patronage rather than to restrict it. When you have one post to fill, and you fill it by appointing a single individual, you discharge your obligation to a political supporter or friend, and to one only; but directly you adopt a system of limited competition for each post you have in your gift, you may throw a sop to half-a-dozen or even a dozen people. It was Lord Palmerston who was cute enough to see that first. He was decidedly in favour of doing away with direct nomination, and of instituting a system of limited competition, because, for every post he had to fill, he was able to satisfy half a-dozen different political supporters instead of one. I am decidedly of opinion, and I trust many other Members of the House are of opinion, that posts in connection with the House of Commons, which is the House of the People, should be as open to public competition as any other post in any other Department of the Public Service; and I trust this concession—for it is a concession—which has now been made will be followed up, and that the next move will be to throw open to public competition all the posts, all the small clerical posts, in connection with the House.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): The hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has correctly stated that these positions are filled up upon what may be called the principle of limited competition. I understand that the plan adopted is that not more than six or less than three men are selected in case of a vacancy; and that these men have to go through a certain examination, and that the one who is most successful receives the appointment. Hon. Members will, however, bear in mind that the Clerk is practically responsible for the conduct of the Business of the House, and that he is not likely to appoint any gentlemen who are in any sense incompetent. I think we may take it for granted that the Clerk will see that none but suitable men are appointed.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I am afraid the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jackson) does not quite see the point of my observations. I did not for one moment question the discretion of the distinguished gentleman who is at present the Clerk of the House of Commons. I am perfectly certain that that gentleman would be incapable of appointing to one of these posts anyone who was not perfectly fitted for it. But the same thing may be said of the Head of every other Department in the Civil Service; and if the argument holds good with regard to the Clerk of the House of Commons, why should it not hold good equally with regard to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Secretary of State for War, and the First Lord of the Admiralty? Surely they can be trusted quite as much as the Clerk of the House of Commons to be as anxious to fill the posts under them by men qualified to occupy them. The question is not the discretion of the Clerk of the House of Commons, but the right of the people of this country to have open to public competition, and to all who will offer themselves and prove themselves qualified, the posts which are connected with the House of the People.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I am sorry the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), who I would describe as a Progressive Conservative, should have taken up the attitude he has upon the point raised by my hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor). There is not a single argument which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jackson) has used that has not been exploded in the course of the controversy which took place a long time ago with regard to the nomination system of this country. Everything the hon. Gentleman has urged in favour of the discretion of the Clerk of the House was urged in favour of the discretion of the Heads of all the other Departments, and we all know what homilies were preached as to the danger to the Service of the country, if the situations in it were exposed to the risks and inconveniences of public competition. The sense of the country and of Parliament upon this question, which has been displayed in an unmistakable manner, is that all situations under the Crown shall be the rewards of success in competitive examinations; and I hope the hon. Gentleman will rise immediately after me, and give us a promise that this last bit of patronage will be taken away, and that the situations in this House will be given as rewards of ability and of knowledge, as are the other posts of the country. Now, as I have risen, perhaps I had better not sit down before I have alluded to one or two other matters on which I should like information from the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury. I find £1,600 is put down for shorthand writers. I assume this is paid to *Hansard* for reporting the debates of the House. Well, Mr. Courtney, I am sure I shall enlist your sympathy in making some inquiries with regard to this question, for I am sure it was largely due to your action that the small reform in the reporting of our debates has taken place. But, Mr. Courtney, what was effected some years ago in regard to reporting our proceedings was but a compromise, and, like most compromises, it left things in a rather worse position than they were in before. What is the present state of affairs? I am sure hon. Members of this House can have no conception of how the reporting of this House is conducted at the present moment. Everybody knows that a revolutionary change has taken place in the reporting of Parliamentary proceedings by the daily Press. Anybody who refers to the newspapers of 30 or 40 years ago will find full reports, not only of the speeches of prominent Members of Parliament, but even of the very inferior and very minor Members of this Assembly. For instance, when Mr. Disraeli, in 1837, got up to make his first historical speech in this House, he was, in a Parliamentary sense, a person of no very great consequence; and yet, if we go back to the daily papers of that day, we find a very full report indeed of the speech of Mr. Disraeli. When a man makes a maiden speech nowadays, we find him dismissed in a couple of lines, or perhaps find him consigned to that limbo of reporting—"after a few words from Mr. So-and-so, Mr. So-and-so said." I mention the case of Mr. Disraeli, because it shows the remarkable importance of the question I am raising. I maintain it is important to the country that it should have a record of the utterances of its public men in the Assembly of the people. A gentleman who has written to me on the subject points out that, in his early days, which are not very remote, the present Leader of the House (Lord Randolph Churchill) made a good many speeches, but in *Hansard* you find him dismissed in three or four lines. You, Mr. Courtney, were one of the Members of this House who first called attention to the defective reporting in this House, and in a Committee which sat upstairs to inquire into the reporting by *Hansard* you elicited the very extraordinary fact that *Hansard* is mainly filled up with the reports of *The Times* newspaper, that the reports in *The Times* are largely regulated by the gentleman who holds the position of chief of the reporting staff of *The Times* newspaper. It therefore comes to this, that the records of the proceedings in this House are entirely dependent upon the will or the judgment—or it may be the caprice—of the chief of the reporting staff of one of our daily newspapers. That was a state of things so extraordinary as to require a remedy, and a remedy was provided. But the remedy was about as extraordinary as it could well be. What was done was this—a certain sum of money was allowed to Mr. Hansard for reporting debates in this House; but Mr. Hansard was strictly confined to——

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The reporting under this head is the reporting of the proceedings before Committees upstairs. The reporting of the proceedings of this House to which the hon. Gentleman refers is provided for in the Stationery Vote, and the discussion with regard to it must take place on that Vote.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I should like to say a word upon the subject raised by the hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor)—namely, the nomination of the clerks in this House. It will be in the recollection of hon. Gentlemen who were Members of the last Parliament that a Motion on this subject was put upon the

Paper by the right hon. Gentleman who is now Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes), who, unfortunately, I do not see in his place to-night. The subject had to be considered by the late Government, and I consulted my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) in regard to the Motion which the right hon. Gentleman the present Postmaster General had put upon the Paper. I have not the exact words of his Motion; but if I remember right, it was to the effect that the nomination of the Clerks of this House ought to be placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker; and certainly we came to the conclusion that the arrangement suggested by the right hon. Gentleman would be better than the existing one, and we should have been prepared to have supported his Motion upon that footing. If the nominations are to be in the hands of any individual, it is well that they should be in the hands of the principal Officer of the House—at all events, that was the conclusion at which we arrived. The hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has raised another important question—namely, whether there ought to be single nominations at all, whether they ought to be an exception to the general rule of the Public Service, whereby places in the Public Service are open to public competition. I confess I am disposed to agree with the hon. Member that, as that principle has been accepted in the Public Service of the country, there is no reason why the appointment of Clerks of this House should be an exception to the general rule. But I would ask the Government to consider this matter, both from the point of view adopted by the hon. Member, and also from the point of view of whether, if the nominations are to continue, they ought not to be in the hands of the Chief Officer of the House who, of course, is Mr. Speaker. I think the present arrangement is capable of improvement, and I hope the Government will look at the matter from that point of view.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I do not quite gather what the right hon. Gentleman is aiming at. Is he aiming at transferring the nomination of the Clerks of the House from the present Clerk of the House to the Speaker?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: That was the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes), and certainly, as between nominations by the principal Clerk and the Speaker, we should prefer nomination by the Speaker. The question of competition was not raised at that time, and, in fact, it had not occurred to me. Now that it has been raised, I do think there is a great deal to be said in favour of the principle of competition, subject, of course, to the control of the Speaker as to the conditions on which the competition should be conducted. If I may take the liberty of expressing it, my present view is that the Speaker should be the Head of the Department, and that the appointments should be open to competition, the conditions of which should be laid down by the Speaker in the same way as conditions of competition are made by the Principals of every other Department of State.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Let me point out to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) that although he has advocated this change, he has not suggested any reason why the change should be made. From time immemorial, as far as I know, this patronage has been vested in the Clerk of the House; it is vested in him by Act of Parliament, and by Letters Patent, and I did not gather from what the right hon. Gentleman is urging that the patronage has been at all improperly disposed. On the contrary, I should say that it is owing to the fact that this patronage was so well disposed by the late Clerk, that the House of Commons is so well served at the present time. Again, there is this to be said. The difference between the Speaker and the Clerk of this House is this—that one is a Member of the House of Commons, and the other is not; and that is certainly a difference which ought to be taken into account before any great change is made. I should also say, though I speak with less knowledge and authority than I wish to on the subject—I should say that the Clerk of the House is brought more into connection with the general clerical staff than the Speaker, and that, therefore, it is important the Clerk should have the direction of that staff. I admit the whole thing might be usefully considered, particularly in connection with the throwing open of the appointments to competition. I understand that the present Clerk of the

House has decided, on his own authority, to make that change. [Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Only partially.] As the Clerk has initiated such a change, it is well that we should proceed cautiously in the matter. There are qualifications which would not necessarily be secured by free and open competition, and, therefore, caution is desirable in making any large change in this matter. But I can assure the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) that what has fallen from him and from other hon. Members will be considered by the Government, and that the Government will, in regard to this subject, enter into careful and close consultation with the authorities of the House.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central): The competition proposed by the Clerk is not open competition; it is a limited competition in which there will be only three nominees. That is a totally different thing to free and open competition. I cannot see why the Clerkships of the House of Commons should be the only exception in the Civil Service to the system of open competition. [An hon. MEMBER: The Foreign Office.] No doubt, there is an exception in the case of the Foreign Office; but in regard to the Clerkships in the Foreign Office, it is to be observed that a considerable number of young men are nominated, so that practically there is a very open competitien. I think that even in the Foreign Office the principle of open competition might be carried out. What greater reason can there be for limiting the nomination or competition in the case of the Foreign Office and the House of Commons, than there is in the case of the Treasury? I venture to say that the Clerks in the Treasury have duties quite as important, quite as confidential, quite as essential in every respect to the Public Service, as the Clerks of the House of Commons or of the Foreign Office. I therefore hope the Government will bring pressure to bear on the Chief Clerk of this House, in order to introduce the system of open competition in the case of the Clerkships in this House. The principle has now been generelly adopted throughout the Public Service, and I do not think it ought to be infringed, even in the case of the Clerkships of this House.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) hopes the Government will bring pressure to bear on the Chief Clerk of the House. I think pressure is not necessary. The Chief Clerk has but one object—the general efficiency of the work of the House of Commons; and, certainly, in the matter of reform in the House, the Government will not take the advice of the right hon. Gentleman to bring pressure to bear on the Chief Clerk. The Government have the fullest confidence in the Chief Clerk who, they know, only desires to be guided by knowledge and information.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: It was stated that a change could not be made without an Act of Parliament, because it is under an Act of Parliament that this patronage is now vested in the Clerk of the House. The initiation of any change must rest with the Government, who, therefore, might legitimately exercise the only pressure to which I referred.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Mr. Courtney, I must object to the tone which the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) has adopted. The noble Lord endeavours to make it appear that we are making this a personal question in regard to the present Clerk of the House. That is not the question at all. My hon. Friend (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) who introduced the subject, began with the declaration that he had the most perfect confidence in the judgement and in the desire to do right of the gentleman who now holds the position of Chief Clerk. The noble Lord, in discussing this question a few moments ago, made an unfavourable contrast between the Clerk of the House and the Speaker of the House. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: No.] He made a contrast most unfavourable to the Speaker. Perhaps the noble Lord does not know exactly what he said. I will repeat for his benefit what he did say, and draw my own conclusions, and the Committee will be at liberty to judge whether my inferences are correct or not. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) drew attention to the fact that the present Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) put down a Motion, during the last Parliament, in favour of transferring this patronage from the Chief Clerk of the House to the Speaker of the House. The right hon. Gentleman was followed by the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), who said it must be recollected that the Chief Clerk was not a Member of the House of Commons, whereas the Speaker was a Member of the House of Commons. What did that plainly mean? I do not object to the observation at all, but what did it mean? It plainly meant that the Speaker, being a Member of the House, was subject to pressure from his constituents. ["No!"] Well, I should like the noble Lord to get up and say what it did mean. What did he mean by drawing a distinction between the Clerk not being a Member of the House of Commons and the Speaker being a Member of the House of Commons in favour of his proposition that the Clerk of the House was a better depository of the patronage of the House than the Speaker? I think it is very necessary the noble Lord should make it clear what he meant.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): I only wish to say one word, as the hon. Gentleman (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) appears to be under some misapprehension. I gave Notice of the Motion to which reference has been made, when the position of the Chief Clerk of the House was vacant, and the Motion contained no reflection either upon the Speaker or the Chief Clerk. When I gave Notice of the Motion, my intention was to suggest that on such an occasion it was desirable to consider whether any change was necessary. I do not in any way attempt by that Notice to prejudge the question which was to be examined by the Committee.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR; The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) has entirely misunderstood my observations. I did not suggest for a moment that he meant to cast any reflection upon the Clerk or the Speaker. What I did say was that I objected altogether to Members being accused of disrespect to particular persons because they wanted to make these positions subject to public competition instead of to patronage. I was merely answering what I considered the most unfair argument of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I have nothing to object to in the remarks of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill); on the contrary, I think they are eminently satisfactory, because by them, he has indicated the readiness of the Government to consider the question, and I do not think we can well expect him to say more. The noble Lord, however, dropped an expression which I should be sorry to let go by without a disclaimer. He seemed to suggest that it was desired to asperse the qualifications of the gentlemen occupying the positions as Clerks under the Clerk of the House of Commons. He probably did not mean that; but I should be sorry such an expression should go abroad without contradiction. Speaking for myself, and I suppose my experience is similar to that of every Member of the House, I have, whenever I have had to have recourse to the staff of the House of Commons, including these gentlemen, always found them not only highly qualified, but eminently courteous; and my remarks had no reference whatsoever to the present officers, but only to the filling up of future vacancies.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £23,506 (including a Supplementary sum of £788), be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Department of Her Majesty's Treasury, and in the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel."

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I have to propose the reduction of this Vote by the sum of £3,000, being a portion of the salary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill). But I may state, at the outset, that there is nothing personal in the matter; in fact, that when in the last Parliament the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) was Chancellor of the Exchequer, I had the same Motion on the Paper. I had also on the Paper a Motion to reduce the salary of every Gentleman sitting on the Treasury Bench—with the exception of that of the Prime Minister, because I thought the right hon. Gentleman occupied an exceptional position—who had £5,000 a-year to £2,000 a-year. I confess it seems a fortunate accident that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's should be the first salary on the list in the present Vote, because the noble Lord who at present occupies that position (Lord Randolph Churchill) has spoken a great deal lately about economy in the Public Departments. The noble Lord has told us that he wishes to appoint a Royal Commission to see whether economy cannot be effected; but I think the tendency of these Royal Commissions generally is to begin economizing by reducing the salaries of small people and not of great people, and I am sure the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer will feel himself bound to accept my Motion. No doubt, I shall have his support in this proposal, for it would be a hint to the Royal Commission whom he proposes to appoint, that he is serious in his desire to promote economy—which is an important desire for one in the position which the noble Lord occupies—were he to agree to the reduction of his salary from £5,000 to £2,000. I remember speaking to the late Mr. Fawcett one day about the salaries of the women in the Post Office. I said to him—"Why do you, who are so strongly in favour of the principle of putting women on an equality with men—why do you pay women less than men?" His reply was that "in every Department you must have regard to the market value of the article," and that "you can get women for less than men." It, therefore, becomes important to see for what we can get a Cabinet Minister. I find that Cabinet Ministers are divided into two categories; some get £5,000 a-year and some £2,000 a-year, and it has always appeared to me, both in regard to the present Government and the last Government, that the Gentlemen who receive £2,000 are just as good value as those who receive £5,000. For instance, take the present Government. We have the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Lord Stanley of Preston), and the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie)—though the latter is not in the Cabinet, but never mind him. The President of the Board of Trade I have always regarded as a most able man—though differing from him on most political questions—yet we get him for £2,000 per annum. Now, can the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer show us, as he is bound to show us if he claims this £5,000 a-year, that he is worth two and a-half times as much as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade? We will take another point. Quite lately a new Minister was created—namely, the Secretary for Scotland. I do not believe that the right hon. Gentleman who at present holds that Office (Mr. A. J. Balfour) happens to be in the Cabinet, but we may naturally suppose that this is a post which will be very frequently filled by Gentlemen in the Cabinet. Well, this Office was created, and the amount of the salary was fixed at a sum which was deemed sufficient for a Minister. What is that sum? £2,000 per annum. That proves conclusively that—in the present day—it is felt that £2,000 per annum is amply sufficient for a Cabinet Minister. But what I would point out is this—and I believe every Gentleman here will agree with me—that it is very objectionable to have two categories in the Cabinet. There is no difference in the work or in the position in the Cabinet; and yet you have some Ministers there receiving £2,000 and others receiving £5,000. What is the consequence? Why, that it is looked upon as a species of promotion to get from the £2,000 class to the £5,000 class. Thus, a man who has made a speciality of a certain subject, it may be that he has been Minister of Commerce as President of Board of Trade, which is one of the most important positions in the Cabinet, may change in a moment into the Minister representing some other Department of the Service. A Gentleman who has made a speciality of commerce, and who may have been President of the Board of Trade for a considerable time, very naturally desires to be something else in the Cabinet, because it means promotion, and it is a very natural wish, nowadays, for a Gentleman to prefer £5,000 per annum to £2,000. But let us look abroad in this matter. It used to be said, "Oh, living is cheaper abroad than in England;" but I should think that living in Paris, or in Berlin, and certainly in Washington, is as dear as living in every other country. What are the salaries paid abroad? Well, a Minister in the United States receives 8,000 dollars per annum—that is, £1,600. In France he receives 60,000 francs per annum, or £2,400. In Prussia the Ministers receive 36,000 marks per annum, or £1,800, with the exception of Prince Bismarck, who receives 54,000 marks, that is to say, £2,600. Therefore, I will not suggest that the President of the Board of Trade is as good a Minister as the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but I will put it that the noble Lord has the ability of Prince Bismarck, and yet Prince Bismarck only receives £2,600 per annum, while the noble Lord receives £3,000 more than the President of the Board of Trade. I think I may say that if Prince Bismarck is adequately paid at £2,600 a-year, the noble Lord would be adequately paid at £2,000 a-year. I would not say that all Cabinet Ministers should be paid £2,000 per annum, because, no doubt, there are exceptions to the general rule. The Prime Minister ought to have something more. He is at the head of the Government, and I think it only reasonable, as is the case in Prussia, that the Prime Minister should have something more. I think also that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Secretary of State for the Colonies should receive something more than £2,000 a-year; for the former should be able to entertain Foreign Ministers, whilst the Secretary of State for the Colonies—although I do not see that either of them do it—should entertain all the Colonial visitors that come to this country. With respect to other Ministers, I really cannot understand why they should be expected to spend more money whilst in Office than they would do if they were not Ministers. Do they entertain anybody? I do not know that they do. They live in a certain position when they are Ministers; but they also live in that position when they are not Ministers. No doubt, they give parties with ices occasionally, but you can do that with an expenditure of very little money. I should think that if you give them £2,000 per annum, you will find that they have made money by the transaction at the end of the year—they will make more out of their salary than the extra cost they are put to by the fact of their being Ministers. I shall be told to-night, perhaps, something about the dignity of these Offices. What does that mean? It simply means the old-fashioned idea that it is a grander thing to be rich than to be poor. But that is an exploded idea. I will admit that it is a more pleasant thing to be rich than to be poor; but to think that a man is a better man because he lives in a large house instead of a small one, and to think that a man who is connected with a Department of the State is bound to live in a house of a certain size is an absurdity. I remember reading in the letters of Sir William Neville that when he went over to Holland he contrasted the surroundings of the Pensionary De Witt with those of Lord Clarendon in this country. Lord Clarendon was a man in receipt of £30,000 or £40,000 a-year, living in a great palace; but when he (Sir William Neville) called upon De Witt, he rang the bell, a servant opened the door and showed him in, and he found the Pensionary occupying three or four rooms. Neville contrasted these two men; and surely it would be absurd to suppose that, because Lord Clarendon lived in greater style, that he was the greater man of the two. Then, with regard to Mr. Pitt. We have always been told what a grand and noble thing it was for Mr. Pitt to die in debt, having been Prime Minister; but, for my own part, I have always considered it the most scandalous thing he ever did, and he did many scandalous things in the course of his career. Mr. Pitt was a young man, and received from the State £15,000 a-year during a large portion of his life, and yet he is to be praised because he could not live at the rate of £15,000 per annum, and because, when he died, his creditors came upon the country to pay his debts. It is because that sort of delusive idea respecting the dignity of Office still exists that it is thought that a man, because he is a Minister, ought to live in a certain way. As a matter of fact, they do not spend more money on account of their Office, and probably they put by all they get as Ministers. This notion about the dignity of Office, indeed, is carried so far, that when a Minister is out of Office, he has only to sign a certificate to the effect that he has not enough money to live in a sufficiently dignified way to obtain a pension from the State of, I think, £2,000 per annum. These pensions do not appear on the Estimates; I only wish they did. Let us consider what the duties of Ministers are. We may divide them into two. They have to attend their own businesses, and they have to look after the affairs of the country at Cabinet

Councils and attend in this House. Probably they have very hard work putting the two things together. But so have we. We do not receive anything, as Ministers do, though we have just as hard work to perform in looking after these right hon. Gentlemen. You cannot suppose that the sheep have more work than the sheep dog. It is all the more important that we should look into these salaries, because there is a tendency to select Ministers from the privileged classes. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members cry "Oh!" but take the present Ministry. The total payment per annum on account of what one sees in the newspapers, when a new Government is formed, under the head of "Ministerial appointments," is something like £160,000. Will the House credit it that £110,000 of this is divided between Peers and Peers' sons. How many Peers are there? About 600, and some of them are Liberals; so that, taking Conservative Peers and their sons, one may doubt whether they will amount to more than 1,000 persons in number. On the other hand, there are 31,000,000 and odd persons that inhabit this country; and yet we are asked to believe that these 1,000 persons possess in an especial way capacities for being Ministers which are not possessed by the 31,000,000 of Her Majesty's subjects. The noble Lord will say this has absolutely nothing to do with the question, just as he did in his reply in reference to the appointment of Mr. Graham as Clerk of the Parliaments. He will say—"These Gentlemen are selected because they are the salt of the earth," the wisest and best of the country's produce, and that, therefore, they must be Ministers. We know what that means. We know what an aristocracy means. We know that we are living under an aristocratic Government, a Government of the privileged classes; and when you talk about looking after economies in the Public Departments, you should not merely look to a Royal Commission composed of three Members of this House and three of the other House, as proposed by the noble Lord, but you should see that these appointments, which seem to be especially in the hands of the aristocracy, are reduced to their absolute market value. It is in that spirit that I move this reduction. My Motion has nothing personal in it, either in regard to the noble Lord or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). I have no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord will support me in the division; and I trust that every hon. Gentleman who hopes ever to attain to the position of Secretary of State will abstain from voting against me.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,506 (including a Supplementary sum of £788), be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses in the Department of Her Majesty's Treasury, and in the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 66; Noes 181: Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 18.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) £40,632, to complete the sum for the Home Office.

MR. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr): I should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) a Question which, on a previous occasion, I put to his Predecessor in regard to the appointment of County Court Judges. Many of the County Court Judges hold also the position of Recorder; and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) held the Office of Home Secretary, I asked him whether he would consent in future, on the appointment of any County Court Judges, to compel them to give up the position of Recorder. I pointed out that the position of Recorder, which had not a shilling of emolument attached to it, was a position of honour which ought to be given, as far as possible, to members of the Bar——

THE CHAIRMAN: The question of the nomination of County Court Judges will not come under this Vote.

MR. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr): I think the question of the appointment of Recorders comes under the Vote, because those appointments are vested in the Home Office, and the point I wish to raise has reference to the Recorders, and not so much to the County Court Judges. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby stated that as far as he was concerned, if he had to deal with the matter, County Court Judges in future would have to give up the position of Recorder. I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will carry out the rule laid down by his Predecessors?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, East): In reply to the hon. Gentleman opposite, he will remember that all the Judges are appointed during good behaviour. I am not aware of any single case of a Recorder who, being appointed Judge of a County Court, has been asked, still less obliged, to give up his Recordership. I can hardly believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby agreed to make that alteration. It is, at any rate, entirely beyond my knowledge.

MR. MOLLOY: I did not say that the late Home Secretary had agreed that those who now unite in themselves the offices of County Court Judge and Recorder should give up the position of Recorder. I referred to the future. When I brought forward this question, I dealt with future appointments, and in that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby agreed with me.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, East): I think my right hon. Friend would not have spoken of a Recorder as being asked to give up the position. It might have been that he said he was not prepared to recommend the appointment to a Recordership, who was at the time a County Court Judge.

MR. MATTHEWS: I must say I approve of what the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) has stated as being the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); but I should certainly hesitate before pledging myself to ask a Recorder to give up that position.

MR. MOLLOY: I did not ask that.

MR. McLAREN (Cheshire, Crewe): I wish to say a few words upon this Vote with regard to the inspection of factories and workshops. The Trades Congress only yesterday passed a resolution to the effect that, in the opinion of the Congress, the Factory, Workshop, and Mine Act was destined to become a dead letter, unless a much closer supervision was inaugurated, and for this purpose a considerable increase in the staff of Factory, Workshop, and Mine Inspectors was indispensible; and that the Congress therefore instructed the next Parliamentary Committee to continue to urge upon the Government the importance of appointing a considerable additional number of practical working men, and, where expedient, women as Factory, Workshop, and Mine Inspectors. It is to the last part of that resolution that I wish to ask the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary. I am a large employer of labour, and I know it is most necessary that there should be a better system of inspection of factories and workshops. At our factory we have no difficulties with the Inspector; he comes there seldom, but I have no doubt that when he does come, he pays attention to those points which it is his duty to attend to. One thing which particularly demands attention is the inspection of tailors' workshops. I have seen numbers of persons employed in those places, which are often underground, and are thoroughly defective in the matter of ventilation. I could give instancess of workshops which the Inspector has only visited once in three years; and I may point out that the Inspector for all the workshops in the North of Scotland lives in Dundee. The tailors in the workshops in Inverness tell me that the Inspector only visits them once in three years. With reference to the employment of women as Inspectors of Workshops where women are employed, I think it exceedingly desirable that women should be appointed in that capacity, and that this system should be adopted as soon as possible. For these reasons I earnestly appeal to Her Majesty's Government to give their attention to this important matter.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I would ask the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Matthews) to give his attention to the desire expressed by the miners for the appointment of men of their own class as Mine Inspectors; and I refer to the distinct declarations on this subject which have been made by the various mining bodies. The men have declared that their interest will never be looked after, until Inspectors of their own class are appointed.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): With reference to this question I would point out that, in a discussion which took place in 1884, opinions were expressed by those who represented the mining population not greatly differing from those of the employers. The desire of both was that the inspection should be efficient. Employers do not concern themselves with regard to the condition in life of Inspectors previously to their appointment; all they wish is that the Inspectors should be competent and qualified men—men possessing at least the qualifications required in the case of certificated managers of mines. With reference to the inspection of factories, I know that in the town which I represent this subject is occupying a good deal of attention on the part of the working classes. What is desired is that the inspection of factories should be efficient and adequate. With regard to the appointment of working men as Inspectors, the desire is, as in the case of mines, that whether the man appointed has worked in a factory or not he should be qualified to judge of those things which it is the duty of an Inspector to ascertain. I would desire to press strongly upon the Secretary of State for the Home Department that if we are to appoint working men as Inspectors of Mines and Factories these are considerations which ought not to be lost sight of by Her Majesty's Government.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I desire to elicit, if possible, from Her Majesty's Government an explanation of what they propose to do with regard to the inspection of mines, because it is at present eminently hopeless to attempt to press forward the Bill which I brought in last Session. That Bill provided for an increase of Inspectors. It is very well known that the staff of Inspectors is insufficient to do the work of a reasonable system of inspection. It is far short of anything of that kind; it is perfectly inadequate to make anything like an approach towards proper inspection. There are mines which ought to be inspected once a quarter—that is to say, the majority of mines; but there are many mines, especially where there is fire-damp, which ought to be inspected at least once a month. The system of inspection at present is ridiculous. I can appeal to anyone acquainted with the mining districts to confirm what I say—namely, that much of the inspection of mines goes on to a great extent after an accident has happened; whereas the pit which is an unsafe one is left uninspected for a long time because there has been no accident in it. I have had a large amount of correspondence from different persons connected with mines, and I find that they agree on this point—namely, that there is a very great need of an increase in the frequency of inspections. If an inspection is to take place at all, it is necessary that it should take place without any communication between the Inspectors and the colliery. It is known that Inspectors sometimes go through their work in a perfunctory manner, and that many preventible accidents arise from the almost entire absence of regular inspection. I know the case of a man in Lancashire who owns several mines, and who boasted once that in every one of his collieries the same man was fireman, roadsman, and overseer. Now, to anyone acquainted with collieries, it is perfectly plain that such a system is a very bad one. As fireman, his duty would be to look after the shutting of the doors; as roadsman, he might have the duty of removing a stone from the road; but, as overseer, it might be his duty to report on the conduct both of the fireman and of the roadsman? What, then, is the use of his reporting when all these duties are concentrated in one person? Now, that is the sort of thing which Inspectors are likely to overlook, and I fear that many accidents are due to causes of that kind. Then, again, from the Midlands I have a communication which says that some of the certificated managers of collieries have, some two, some four, and some as many as twelve collieries under their management. In the Mines Regulation Act, 1872, it says, in reference to this matter, that every colliery should be under the daily superintendence and control of a certificated manager. Hon. Members will observe that the law is that there should be daily superintendence; and I am satisfied that if the Inspectors would inquire, they would find that, in many cases, a number of collieries were under the nominal superintendence and control of managers under the Act of 1872. I say, then, it is a physical impossibility for a man to discharge the duties incumbent on a manager under that Act; but this is a point which Inspectors seldom report upon, or take the trouble to inquire into. I will not trouble the Committee further with this question, which resolves itself into this

—that it is absolutely necessary there should be a very large increase in the number of Inspectors of Mines. Now, we shall be told that you will not pay for what my Bill proposes—that is to say, 130 Inspectors instead of 30. But, Sir, it would be better to have 230 Inspectors in order to prevent accidents; and, therefore, I hope that this House will not consent to sacrifice the people engaged in mines to the niggardly policy of the Government. Not long ago, when there was a bad smell in this House, the Government did not hesitate to take the matter in hand and spend money, because the health of a score of men were jeopardized; but here you have many men, men who are the cause of the wealth of this country, and who are exposed to preventible dangers all the year round, which could be avoided altogether if you had anything like an efficient system of inspection. I hope, before the end of the Session, the working and mining population will obtain from the Government some assurance, no matter what the expense may be, of that protection which they have a right to expect.

Mr. CHANNING (Northampton, E.): With regard to the adequacy of the inspection of workshops, I have received since I had the honour of a seat in this House repeated communications from my own constituency with reference to the very inadequate inspection of workshops there. I had a letter the other day which stated that a workshop, where there were employed 400 men, had not been inspected for four years. I make these few remarks simply in confirmation of what has fallen from the hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. McLaren).

Mr. MATTHEWS: I sympathize very much with almost all that has been said by the hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. McLaren) and the hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) on the subject of the inspection of mines. I think that no one who is acquainted with mines, and takes into account the enormous extent of underground workings, the great difficulty of examining those workings from the working face to the bottom of the shafts, who measures the mileage which an Inspector would have to travel in the course of a year, can say that the Inspecting Staff is otherwise than very insufficient; but an increase of Inspectors means increase of cost. The Estimates in this respect have been steadily growing year after year, and the hon. Member for East Donegal knows perfectly well how the salaries of Inspectors have grown from time to time. In view of that fact, it would be a very difficult thing to provide such an increase in the number of Inspectors as would be necessary to carry out the system of inspection which we all desire for the protection of the men engaged in the perilous operations of collieries. Of course, in these Estimates, no such provision could be made; but if there should prove to be any disposition on the part of this House to make such provision I should be glad. The same observations apply to the inspection of factories and workshops. It is a physical impossibility for the Inspectors to go through all the workshops in their districts; but here, again, the question of cost arises. There is a difficulty of getting the consent of the Treasury to the expenditure of the money that would be required for an extended system of inspection, although, so far as I am aware, there has never been any lack of desire on the part of the Home Office to increase the staff of Inspectors. The hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. McLaren) expressed a desire that women should be appointed as Inspectors. I entirely agree with him that, in large towns, women should be employed to inspect milliners' and other shops where women are employed; but I am by no means prepared to say that there are under the present law powers to appoint women. I will, however, undertake to look into that matter, and I shall be extremely glad if I can find that there is power under which women can be appointed. The desire has also been expressed that working men should be appointed as Inspectors. I have only had to do with the appointment of one Inspector; and in that case I did my utmost to have a working man appointed. The hon. Member will be aware that there are certain difficulties in the way of this arrangement. There is a limit as to age, and other rules laid down by the Privy Council; and here, again, the Treasury are bound to object. The Treasury are a little stubborn on the point of pay. Then there is the further difficulty on the point of examination. A working man naturally finds it difficult at the age of 35 to go through an examination in vulgar and decimal fractions, which, under the present regulations, would be required of him. It is true that I have to some extent an expansive power in this matter. I have had to interfere in one instance, and I should certainly be disposed to exercise that power again in favour of an efficient and competent working man. With regard to the other matters, however, hon. Members will see that in attempting to deal with them the Home Office would be met with difficulties, not the least of which would be that of finance.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH (Hants, Basingstoke): I should like to have heard some expressions of sympathy with the Treasury from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Matthews) in resisting these encroachments on the public purse. I venture to say that this is not a question of money alone. The system which has been advocated in this discussion is one for the carrying out of which not hundreds but thousands of Inspectors would be required, and the cost of which it is impossible to calculate. And not only that, but the proposal is one which, if it were carried out, would have the effect of demoralizing both servants and masters, and would destroy, by carrying too far, a system which points out what are the obligations between the two classes. Now, if the right hon. Gentleman were to yield to the requests of hon. Members opposite, he would soon be made open to the charge of extravagance as well as of having abolished a sense of responsibility, and created a false reliance on a system of excessive inspection. I have offered these few remarks because I desire to make my protest against Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench swallowing the extravagant suggestions which have been made on this subject, which, if they were adopted, would be sure to lead to great financial difficulties, and would be open to other and very serious objections.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I will ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to concede this point—that inquiries in cases of accident should be conducted openly. At present, when there has been an accident in a mine, and the mine has to be inspected, the inspection is of a very close and almost secret nature. The only persons who are allowed to attend are practically Her Majesty's Inspector and the manager, and the inquiry takes place at the particular colliery where the accident has occurred. I think there is no doubt that if the Government would make arrangements that there should be an open inquiry, a great many things would be revealed which relate to the causes of accidents, and which are now cloaked by the present secrecy of the proceedings. This is an arrangement which would cost no money, and would be the means of getting men to come forward and give evidence as to the mode in which the mine is worked. At present these things are very closely cloaked, and evidence is not always forthcoming; whereas if the men were allowed to know what was going on, and to point out to the Inspectors the facts within their knowledge, it is very likely that many accidents would be prevented.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I hope the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth) will be taken to heart by the mining population of this country. It is rather astonishing that any Member of the House can be found to make such observations in the face of the fact that there has been an increase in the number of fatal accidents in mines.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £31,671, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will now (12.30) agree to report Progress. We see that hon. Members cannot keep awake; besides it is generally considered that the money of the country ought not to be voted after half-past 12.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) whether the arrangements with reference to the Legal Department of the Foreign Office, which were approaching completion when the late Government went out of Office, have been completed? A Departmental Committee recommended the change which, I think, involves a saving of £1,000 or £2,000 a year.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir

JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The arrangements are all but complete. There has been a difficulty with the Treasury as to some small matters of detail; but it has now been overcome, and the arrangements will be immediately completed.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): I really think that at this period of the evening (12.35), and especially in view of the fact that the Vote we are now asked to discuss—that for the Foreign Office—is one which should be criticized amply and thoroughly, it is high time to report Progress; and if it is the wish of the Committee I shall have much pleasure in making the Motion that you, Mr. Courtney, do now report Progress.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Perhaps it will be convenient for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say what progress he thinks would be reasonable to make with Supply to-night?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): The hon. Gentleman (Dr. Tanner) may not be aware that Committee of Supply generally sits long after half-past 12. [Colonel NOLAN: No; half-past 12.] The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) will bear me out that the Committee of Supply always sits later than half-past 12. Of course, we are anxious, considering the period of the year, to make an unusual effort to make progress with Supply. Hon. Members will also bear in mind that from one cause or another we were not able to commence the work of Supply this evening until after 9 o'clock. I trust that we may rely on the co-operation of hon. Members to get through the work as speedily as possible.

MR. SEXTON: The reason why I asked the question was that yesterday the Navy Vote relating to the supply of ammunition was postponed, and I have a question to raise upon it.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Perhaps it will be better to proceed until we get to some Vote which involves a lengthy discussion.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co. Mid.): I simply rise to move that you, Mr. Courtney, do now report Progress. I think we have now arrived at an hour of the evening when the proceedings of the Committee ought to cease. I merely repeat what I said a few moments ago—that this is a Vote which requires strict investigation, and the hour is already too advanced to enter into such an investigation. I have been here night after night—[*A laugh.*] Hon. Members may laugh; but I have been here night after night when Business emanating from these Benches was not allowed to come on after this hour, and when hon. Gentlemen, some of whom now adorn the Treasury Bench, got up one after another and moved that the House do adjourn. Now, Sir, I beg to move that you do now report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Dr. Tanner.*)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): I must agree with the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) that the discussion on the Motion to go into Committee did occupy a great portion of the evening, and also that it is not usual in Committee of Supply to move to report Progress at half-past 12. I am certainly inclined to ask my hon. Friend (Dr. Tanner) not to press his Motion; but I would couple with that request an appeal to the Government not to take many more Votes.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £17,016, to complete the sum necessary for Colonial Office.

(9.) £22,816, to complete the sum necessary for Privy Council Office.

(10.) £46,817, to complete the sum necessary for Board of Trade.

(11.) £142, to complete the sum necessary for Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.); I am not going to detain the Committee more than one moment; but I desire to ask whether it is not a fact that there were considerable misunderstandings, or indications of dissatisfaction, in the Department of the Chief Official Receiver under this Vote, and whether a Committee was not appointed to inquire into the cause of the complaint; and, if so, whether any Report was made by the Committee, and what was the nature of the Report?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS)

(Liverpool, East Toxteth): In answer to the question of the hon. Gentleman, I may say that an inquiry has been made into the working of this Department, and that the Report of the Committee is in the hands of the Department. I am afraid the Report must be considered strictly confidential, and that I cannot, therefore, communicate its nature to the Committee. At the same time, I may assure the hon. Gentleman that the working of the Department is now very satisfactory, and that there is every reason to believe that friction will be avoided in the future.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask the hon. Gentleman if he can, without divulging any official secrets, say whether the system under which the Chief Official Receiver disposes of the allowance for his clerical staff is to continue? There is an abnormal condition of things in this Department. The Chief Official Receiver is allowed a certain sum of money for a clerical staff. This staff is partly composed of men who were in professional life before the formation of the Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade, and who were induced to come into what they called the Public Service by representations that if they did so they would obtain permanent appointments and have a right to pensions. It appears the Chief Official Receiver has been allowed by the Government to treat these clerks as if they were his own personal clerks. He was allowed some thousands of pounds a-year for the purpose of paying the clerks. I believe he has recently been compelled to disgorge the money unexpended, and that the accounts are now audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General. But the clerks are not allowed to be Civil Service clerks, but are absolutely at the disposal of this official, who himself is supposed to hold only a temporary appointment. Their whole position is exceedingly unsatisfactory, both from the Public Service point of view and from the individual point of view of the persons concerned. Will the hon. Gentleman say if the present system is to be continued, and, if it is not, what will be the position of these clerks in future?

BARON HENRY DE WORMS: The system of which the hon. Gentleman complains will not be continued; but the position of these clerks in future will be governed by the provisions of Schedule B. They will rank as *quasi*-Civil servants, but not be entitled to superannuation allowances.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Touching the Board of Trade Office in the City of Cork. The Board of Trade Office——

THE CHAIRMAN; The Vote for the Board of Trade has been agreed to; this is the Vote for the Bankruptcy Department.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £14,965, to complete the sum necessary for Charity Commission.

(13.) £14,554, to complete the sum for the Civil Service Commission.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): I think, that as we have taken the last two or three Votes very easily, the Government should not begrudge the time necessary to answer a query as to their intentions with regard to the Civil Service writers and clerks of the Lower Division. I do not want to go into the details of their case; no doubt, every Member of the Committee is conversant with them; but, as far as we learn, nothing has been done, and nothing of a satisfactory character has been promised to be granted to either of these classes of public servants. Their case is certainly one which does deserve some attention at the hands of Her Majesty's Government.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I am sure the hon. Member does not desire to state the case unfairly. Although it is true that in the answers to many Questions which were put to me last week I was unable to make any definite announcement, I can assure him that it is not a fair or accurate statement of the case to say that nothing has been done. The position of these public servants has been engaging the attention of the Treasury. The hon. Member knows that the Treasury has not lately been in the most favourable position for considering such matters, because within the last 15 months there have been, I believe, six separate occupants of the position I now hold. The hon. Member and the Committee knows that under such circumstances it is most difficult for anyone to find the time to give continuous examination to such a difficult question as this. Although I have not seen it, I have the best reason for supposing that the draft of the Report of the Departmental Committee has been prepared, and is now awaiting correction. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that a great deal of time and attention has been given to the question of the condition of the Civil Service writers and Lower Division clerks, and that we hope very shortly to be in a position to say something definite, or to make some proposals.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: The hon. Gentleman was good enough to say that the language I used was scarcely fair, and then he imputed language to me which I did not use.

Mr. JACKSON: It was certainly not my intention to say that the hon. Gentleman's language was unfair.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I said that, so far as we had been able to learn, nothing had been done, and I think the Committee will agree with me that even the answer of the hon. Gentleman does not enlighten us particularly as to what has been done. We are given to understand that because there have been six occupants of the post he now so worthily fills, within the short space of 15 months, nothing has been done, but that a great deal of consideration has been given to the matter, and that some time or other shortly the hon. Gentleman will be in a position to make some statement as to what it is intended to do. My complaint is that, year after year, these unfortunate men have been treated most unfairly; many of them have had to do work far above the grade for which they are paid—far above the work which they ought to be given according to their *status;* and though they have all sorts of prospects of improvement held out year after year, they find themselves precisely in the same position as they were at the beginning. We get these assurances from every Administration; but really nothing whatsoever is done.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Lord Randolph Churchill) (Paddington, S.): The Government have really had no time to turn round, and this subject is one of great importance. It has, as the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) has just said, been the subject of anxious and close consideration by a Departmental Committee. The Report of that Committee will, in due course, receive the anxious consideration of the Treasury.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): I see that there is a charge in this Vote for advertisements, and I should like to receive some information as to the newspapers in Ireland to which advertisements are given. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen cry "Oh, oh!" but I will nevertheless explain the reason why I make this inquiry. In Ireland it is unfortuately the experience that Government advertisements are always given to one class of newspapers only; what are known as the Castle newspapers in Ireland get all the advertisements, and it is well known that these newspapers are about the least fitted for the advertisements. The papers that are most read in Ireland are the Nationalist newspapers, and they never get any of these advertisements at all. Now, I want to receive an assurance that these advertisements will in future be given to the Nationalist newspapers in Ireland as well as to the Castle newspapers, and unless I get an assurance to that effect I shall certainly move to reduce the Vote by £500, the amount asked in respect of advertisements.

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I am sorry I am unable to give the hon. Gentleman the information he asks. I do not know how the money is expended; but if the hon. Gentleman will accept my assurance I will look into the matter, and endeavour to secure a fair and proper distribution of the advertisements amongst the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CLANCY: I am afraid the assurance of the hon. Gentleman is hardly satisfactory; it is a little too vague. I ask for a distinct pledge, and certainly I will go to a division if I do not get it. I ask for a distinct pledge that these advertisements will be given to the Nationalist newspapers in Ireland as well as to the Castle newspapers. I ask for that on the ground that these newspapers are the most widely read, and that consequently from the point of view of the Public Service it is most advantageous to advertise in these journals. [*Interruption.*] If I am interrupted in making the remarks which I consider necessary in regard to this matter I will certainly do my utmost to detain the

Committee until I get a satisfactory assurance.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I trust the hon. Member will give my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) time to examine the records of the Office, so that he may ascertain correctly what newspapers the advertisement do appear in. This is not a subject which my hon. Friend could imagine was likely to be brought up, nor do I understand that the hon. Member (Mr. Clancy) is exactly informed on the subject. If he will allow this matter to stand over, I am sure my hon. Friend will be glad to make a statement either in reply to a Question or on the stage of Report. Of course, if the statement is not satisfactory, it will be within the power of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Clancy) to oppose the Vote.

MR. CLANCY: I accept the suggestion of the noble Lord; but I think it right to mention, in defence of the action I have taken, that I recollect distinctly an application being made last year by the proprietor of a Nationalist paper in Dublin to the Board of Works for certain advertisements which were to be given to the public Press. I remember that these vague assurances that justice would be done were given by the authorities, and I am informed that from that day to this not a single advertisement has been given by the Board of Works to a Nationalist newspaper.

Vote *agreed to.*

(14.) £20,955, to complete the sum for the Exchequer and Audit Department.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): This is a large Vote, raising questions of some importance, and therefore perhaps the noble Lord will consent to report Progress.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) (Paddington, S.): I hope hon. Members will allow us to take the Navy Votes which stood over from yesterday, and to which, I understand, there is no objection to their being taken.

MR. SEXTON: This Vote was postponed in consequence of a misapprehension.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): One Vote was postponed on account of a misapprehension, but another Vote had not been reached at the time for adjournment.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to raise one or two questions on the Navy Votes.

Vote *agreed to.*

NAVY ESTIMATES.

(15.) £61,600, to complete the sum for Medicines and Medical Stores, &c.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): Upon this Vote I desire to ask some explanation from the Government of a small matter that is connected with the appropriation in aid. If the soldiers and sailors in the Army and Navy are invalided, if they are rendered unfit for duty by causes which result in and from the Service, they are mulcted of their pay. It is very unfair that they should be so mulcted. When a sailor, from exposure to weather, from such causes as the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Charles Beresford) dwelt upon yesterday, is broken down in health, and has to go to the hospital, is broken down by reason of his services and only by reason of his services, it is very unfair that he should be deprived of his pay. If a soldier or sailor brings on illness, whether it be *delirium tremens* or any other form of sickness incurred through his own misconduct, he is liable to have his pay stopped altogether. That is only fair and reasonable, because if he renders himself unfit for duty he has no claim to the pay which attaches to duty; but when a man is, by reason of his fidelity to duty, and by reason of circumstances over which he has no control, and in consequences of services, become invalided and obliged to go to hospital for a week or a month, or it may be for six months, I say that man has a right to receive his pay without any deductions at all in the shape of hospital stoppages, or, at any rate, the hospital stoppages should not amount to more than he would have to pay for rations if he were out of hospital and on active service. What I submit to the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) in charge of this Vote is that in future there should be by Warrant, or by whatever the official instrument may be, a regulation made by which invalided soldiers shall be entitled to receive their hospital treatment without any further hospital stoppages than would amount to the sum they would have stopped from their pay in case they were not in hospital.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The point which the hon. Gentleman has raised is one which I am bound to say I have not looked into, though I know the general operation is very much as he has stated. Of course, if any alteration is made it will result in an increased Vote, and that is rather a serious matter. I will look into the matter, and between now and Report obtain the information that will enable me to give the hon. Gentleman an answer.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Will the noble Lord be good enough to go further, and use his influence with the War Office to secure that a similar system will be adopted in the Army Service as in the Navy Service, and that soldiers shall not be mulcted of their pay for hospital stoppages if their sickness is due from the service?

Vote *agreed to.*

(16.) £134,700, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Services.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the case of the widow of a man named Patrick Hooper, who served for many years in the Royal Navy and died from a complaint accelerated by injuries he received whilst in the performance of his duties. He was injured in 1866; again in July 1884 he received another injury to the left side which incapacitated him; and in the following January he died. I have here a medical certificate as to the cause of the man's decease in which the medical gentleman states what was the direct cause of death, but points out that the ailment was rendered fatal by the injuries the man had received from accidents which had occurred to him whilst in the performance of his duty. The Regulations affecting allowances to widows and children of deceased sailors set forth that assistance is to be rendered in cases where death results from accidents or from the effects of injuries caused by accidents which are met with whilst in the execution of duty. The wife of the man to whom I refer wrote to the Admiralty asking for some allowance, but was told that the circumstances attending her husband's death did not entitle her to a grant from the Greenwich Hospital Fund. I am not expert enough in the matter of these Regulations to say that this decision was incorrect; but I do contend that when a man has served for years in the Navy, has earned both the long service and the good conduct medals, and has received injuries in the Service which has accelerated his death, his widow and children are entitled to some assistance from the Admiralty. The man leaves behind him a wife and seven children, five of whom are under 14 years of age. The widow has never even received the gratuity to which she is entitled on account of the good conduct medal. I appeal to the First Lord of the Admiralty to say whether or not this woman should receive the Greenwich Hospital pension, and to say whether the case is not one which should be dealt with in a generous spirit.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): If the hon. Member will be good enough to send the particulars of the case, I will make a careful inquiry into the matter; but I could not say off-hand that the widow ought or ought not to receive a pension. I do not know the man's age, or the Rules of that branch of the Service in which he was engaged at the time of his death. I do not know on what ground a pension was refused to the widow—whether or not it was that the cause of death did not justify the grant. Last year there were two cases decided in which it was considered that too technical a construction had been put upon the Regulations relating to cause of death, and I directed that pensions should be paid to the widows. I should be glad to do what is right in the case to which the hon. Gentleman draws my attention; but, of course, I cannot give an answer to his question off-hand. If he will allow me the use of the papers bearing on the case I will inquire into it, and shall be in a position to make a statement with regard to it to-morrow on Report of Supply.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I wish to draw the attention of the noble Lord to the subject of the Cork Sailors' Home. I may say that I did not know the Vote was coming on, and, consequently, am unprepared with certain documents which I had intended to use, and which would have enabled me to put the case clearly before the noble Lord. Ten years ago, the Cork Sailors' Home received from the Admiralty a grant of £100. Of course, the numbers who made use of the Home were greater than they have been since—or up to quite recently. Being situated in a very central position in the port of Cork, it is naturally made use of by a large number of merchant seamen. It was established, like similar institutions throughout the United Kingdom, for the accommodation of seamen who happened to be on shore, and to save them from the lodging-house keepers who had been in the habit of treating them almost as sharks treat small fish. Well, this Cork Sailors' Home, owing to the admirable work it did, was granted first £50, then £75, then the grant was increased from £75 to £100. Subsequently, however, another Sailors' Home was started in the port of Queenstown; and, naturally enough, the sailors who happened to be at Queenstown on board the flagship made use of it every time they went on shore, and, of course, their names were taken down as having been in it. In that way this Home was able to show a very large list of men of the Royal Navy having been to it, and, as time went on, owing to the efforts of some very influential people in the district, and owing to what I do not care to go into—namely, the action of a gentleman who has since died—*de mortuis nil nisi bonum*—the Sailors' Home at Queenstown advanced at the expense of the institution at Cork. The grant to the Cork Home was cut down to £75, from that to £50, and from that again to £25. Now, I desire to draw attention to this matter. Unfortunately, in Ireland, where money is scarce, charitable institutions are proportionately scarce. I am certain that every one in the House who knows anything at all of the subject will bear me out that these Sailors' Homes are very valuable institutions, and that they ought to be supported as far as we possibly can support them. I happen to have been Secretary to the Cork Sailors' Home for about a year and a-half; therefore, I know something about that establishment, and feel very much for it in regard to the way it has unfortunately gone down. The greater part of the money formerly granted to the Cork Sailors' Home has been taken from that institution and given to the Queenstown Home. I can produce Returns from the Cork Home to show clearly and conclusively and distinctly the number of sailors belonging to the Merchant Service who frequent it, and the number who frequent the Queenstown Home; and it will be found that the majority go to the former institution, because it is situated in the city of Cork, where the men have the Board of Trade offices, and where they can more easily ship on board vessels that sail from the port of Cork. I should be able to show the Committee, if I had the documents to which I have referred with me, that if you made an increased grant to the Cork Sailors' Home—if it were only £25 per annum, and you might divide £50 between the two institutions—you would be doing an act of charity and conferring a great benefit on the men of both the Merchant Service and Her Majesty's Navy. The number of sailors belonging to the Royal Navy who have passed through the city of Cork recently—that is to say, since the Channel Fleet went to Bantry Bay to perform their annual evolutions—has been very great indeed. Last year no less than 400 of these men passed through the city, the greater part of them obtaining accommodation in the Sailors' Home; and I feel perfectly confident that if the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) will only look into the matter he will be able to recommend the Admiralty to give us that increased support which is absolutely necessary for the success of the Home. I would ask the noble Lord to discount the utterances which have from time to time been given forth to the detriment of the Cork Home. Unfortunately, as I have said, there were in the past many faults to be found with the establishment, owing to the action of a gentleman who is no longer living; but, at the same time, I think that if the noble Lord were to listen to what the late Admiral Commander-in-Chief on that Station said about the Home, and to what the present Admiral at Queenstown has said, he would have no hesitation in advising the Admiralty to bestow an increased grant upon the Cork Sailors' Home.

MR. PENROSE-FITZGERALD (Cambridge): I think I can, perhaps, more or less, answer the observations of the hon. Gentleman opposite, with regard to these two Sailors' Homes, without making any very lengthened remarks. I am happy to be able to inform the Committtee that there is at the present moment a scheme on foot for amalgamating the two Homes, and I am sure that in the endeavour to promote that scheme we shall have the advantage of the assistance of the hon. Member himself, who has already taken deep interest in the Cork Sailors' Home. I need not go into details with regard to these Homes. They are both admirable institutions, and I only hope that they will be amalgamated under one Committee, and that every effort will be made to put an end to the spirit of rivalry and competition which has taken place between them. If we should be able to bring about this amicable settlement, we shall then be in a position to arrive at a distinct understanding as to the manner in which the Government grants should be bestowed.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I quite understand what the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Fitzgerald) has stated. I am aware that he has taken a great deal of interest in the Queenstown Sailors' Home, against which I should be loth to say a word. All these institutions are worthy of support. But what I am anxious to impress upon the noble Lord is—and I feel certain that the hon. Member will agree with me—that the Cork Sailors' Home is more fitted for sailors of the Mercantile Marine than the Queenstown Home, which is more patronized and taken advantage of by the sailors in Her Majesty's Service. The scheme the hon. Member opposite refers to has often been brought forward; but, unfortunately, while plans of this kind are being considered, these institutions are suffering. If the noble Lord would allow me, I certainly would suggest that until some *raison d'être* has been arrived at an equal grant of £50 should be made to each of these institutions.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): I think it is unnecessary for me to take any part in this discussion, seeing that the observations of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Dr. Tanner) have already been answered by the hon. Gentleman behind me (Mr. Fitzgerald). The Admiralty have only a certain sum at their disposal for the maintenance of Sailors' Homes, which, I believe, were originally established for the benefit of the men of the Royal Navy, and they are obliged to distribute that as best they can. I observe that it is because the sailors daily make more use of the Home at Queenstown than of that at Cork that a larger sum is paid to the former than to the latter. I trust that that which I hear as probable will come about, and that the two institutions will be amalgamated. In this way all dispute as to the relative merits of the two institutions would cease. The amount then paid to the institutions would be in one sum, and, the administration and other arrangements being amalgamated, the united institutions would be on a much better footing than they are now. I cannot undertake to give more money to these institutions than is provided for in the Estimate. It would not be in my power to do so. We are limited to the sum in the Estimate.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): I think the noble Lord is in error in imagining that the Sailors' Homes throughout the country were instituted for the benefit of the men of the Royal Navy; on the contrary, I think, if the noble Lord will go into the history of these establishments, he will find that they were started by merchants in Liverpool for the benefit of the sailors of the Mercantile Marine, and were at first maintained wholly by the subscriptions raised in the country. Then the Government granted them allowances. If the noble Lord will allow me to say so, I think he will find that he is mistaken in his idea as to the origin of these Homes. With regard to the matter to which I have already directed his attention, if he will compare these two Homes, he will see that the one at Cork ought to be supported. I know that a dead set has been made against the Cork Home—and whilst I am on my legs I will say what is in my mind on this subject. The Cork Home was an institution supported by the citizens of Cork. An aristocratic clique living in the vicinity of Queenstown were not satisfied unless they got the matter all their own way. They started a little arrangement, got the support of the Admiral and some of the naval officers in Queenstown, and then said—"We will smash down the Cork Sailors' Home." They have done their best to carry out that declaration. They have not exactly smashed down the Cork Home yet; but I think that when an injustice is being perpetrated by an aristocratic clique of landlords—some broken-down, landlords and some rich ones, all of whom I cannot describe as gentlemen—the Government should come to the rescue of the victims of this injustice. I submit that these aristocratic gentlemen are endeavouring to do harm to a charity in order to enhance their own position and purchase cheap popularity. [*A laugh.*] Of course, the hon. Gentleman opposite laughs; he is distinguished for his sneering and laughter in the course of these debates; but I trust he will restrain himself whilst the particular subjects of these Homes for the sailors of the Mercantile Marine and Royal Navy are on the *tapis*. I really think that if the noble Lord and Her Majesty's Government will go carefully into the matter they will see that it is wrong to give State aid to enable gentlemen to feather their twopenny-halfpenny——

THE CHAIRMAN: I must observe that the hon. Member is wandering very much from the point.

DR. TANNER: I thought I was talking about the Sailors' Home.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

DR. TANNER: If the noble Lord will go into the merits of the case and see the way in which this dispute was brought about between the two Sailors' Homes, I feel perfectly confident that he will make the Cork Home the grant that was made in the past—namely, £100 per annum. As I have said, it was cut down from £100 to £75; it was further reduced from £75 to £50; and then, finally, it was cut down to £25; and that was done by a certain clique for a certain purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is still wandering from the subject of the Vote. The rivalry between two Sailors' Homes is not the matter under the consideration of the Committee.

DR. TANNER: I am endeavouring to deal with the subject before the Committee, and to give reasons why the Vote should be increased. I will, however, bow to the Chair. I sincerely trust that the noble Lord, having heard what I have said, and having read the documents which I shall be happy to furnish him with, will take the side of justice and truth, and will grant the Cork Sailors' Home, if not the original amount, at least £50 per annum.

MR. DEASY (Mayo, W.): As I have for the last couple of years had occasion to consider this subject, I desire to say a word or two with regard to it. I do not wish to enter into the question of the rival merits of these Homes—though I may have my own opinion on that matter—or into the grant, or part of the grant, having been withdrawn from the Cork Sailors' Home; but unless a satisfactory answer is given by the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) on the subject, if my hon. Friend persists in demanding favourable consideration for it, and feels it his duty to bring it before the House on the Report stage, I shall give him my cordial support. I think great injustice has been done to the Cork Institution. I have gone into the matter very closely; and though I have no interest in either one Home or the other, I think the noble Lord ought to decide in favour of the claims of the Cork Home, as against those of the Queenstown Establishment, because Cork is a great centre for sailors, whether they belong to Her Majesty's Navy or to the Merchant Service, and it is the place they are most likely to go to when they want shelter. I think, if the noble Lord will only give close attention to the facts of the case, he will be disposed to alter the opinion he seems to have formed on the statement of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge (Mr. Fitzgerald), who is himself a Queenstown man, and is, therefore, prejudiced in favour of the Queenstown Home. I believe that hon. Member would do nothing unfair, but it is certain that on account of his connection with Queenstown, he is anxious to do all he can for the Home there, and has not the same regard for the institution at Cork. The noble Lord has formed his opinion upon the statement of that hon. Member. I do not at all object to the spirit of the hon. Member's speech, and, so far as I am concerned, I am extremely anxious that the quarrel between the rival Homes should come to an end, and that a satisfactory arrangement should be arrived at. I believe the arrangement referred to by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Fitzgerald) would be a satisfactory settlement of the dispute that has been carried on now for some years; but, in the meantime, I would suggest that the request made by my hon. Friend (Dr. Tanner) should be favourably considered by the noble Lord, because it is really a matter of serious importance to the sailors that the Cork Sailors' Home should be conducted in such a manner as to be valuable to those people who from time to time find themselves obliged to apply to it. If the facts are given to him by my hon. Friend, I hope the noble Lord will be prepared to consider the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have already stated the principle on which the distribution of this money is made. It was formerly paid to the Sailors' Homes in the interests of the men in Her Majesty's Navy. If it is true that a larger number of sailors make use of one of the Homes to which reference has been made, than make use of the other, no doubt it is right that an attempt should be made to do justice between the two.

Dr. TANNERt(Cork, Co., Mid): The noble Lord will pardon me—[" Divide! "] —I rise to make an explanation—will the noble Lord go carefully through the figures in the case of each Home, and in doing so will he make sure that the figures furnished by the authorities of the Queenstown Home represent the number of men *bonâ fide* dwelling and sleeping in the Sailor's Home for the night, just as the figures from the Cork Home represent the number of men who have entered the establishment and remained in it for the night? I hope he will make sure that he does not count as persons really using the Home the "shore men," commonly so-called, who come in on tramp from the Guard Ship, wash their hands and comb their hair and go out again. Such men as these are entered on the books of the Queenstown Home, and such entry, unfortunately, gives rise to a great deal of ill feeling on the subject. I sincerely hope that the noble Lord on this occasion will grant us what we ask.

Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—REPORT.

Postponed Resolution [7th September] *considered.*

(1.) "That a sum, not exceeding £1,369,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge for the Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores for Land and Sea Service (including Establishments of Manufacturing Departments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1887."

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W., and Sligo, S.): Sir, I wish to ascertain, from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, what are the conditions and terms upon which ammunition is supplied from Her Majesty's stores to certain registered Rifle Clubs in Ireland, and especially in the town of Belfast? Recent events compelled me to make particular inquiries into the subject, and the result of my investigations led me to believe that the Secretary of what is known as a Registered Rifle Club, in Ireland, has only to send a request to a keeper of Her Majesty's ammunition stores in order to obtain as much ammunition as he wants at the cost of production. I am informed that the local clubs are supplied in this way with gunpowder. I need scarcely tell the right hon. Gentleman that there are no Nationalists in these clubs, which are composed only of persons of one creed and one political conviction; and when it is considered that the people of Ireland are debarred by legislative enactment from carrying arms, it becomes a serious question whether the money which the taxpayers supply for the Military Service of the Queen should be used in arming and supplying ammunition at cost price to a privileged class of persons; and, not only that, it is a serious question for the taxpayer, and also for the ordinary trader, because in Belfast there are persons who have to pay for licences to the Crown for selling ammunition, and these persons are undersold by the system I have described. There is a well-founded impression also that ammunition was recently procured from the Queen's stores in Ireland, and used in the streets of Belfast for the purposes of riot and murder. The right hon. Gentleman is aware that on two Sunday mornings, the 8th and 15th of August, there was a fusillade maintained in the Springfield quarter of the town, of which Inspector Warburton and his constables were the object. They were in a field in the suburb, and it was fortunate for them that they were able to get behind a pile of bricks there, because they were fired upon, and it was only in that way that they escaped death. It was observed that the men firing at them were excellent marksmen, and they were able to satisfy themselves that the ammunition was of excellent quality. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War could not do better than send to Belfast to inquire into this matter. I want to know how it is that Rifle Clubs of this sort get into relations with Her Majesty's Government? Again, how many clubs of this kind are there in Ireland; and what is the number of their members? It will be a serious question if it should turn out that not only ordinary citizens, but the Queen's soldiers and the police, are to be fired at and shot down on strictly economical principles with ammunition supplied at cost price. I think, as the people of Ireland generally are disarmed, that if there is a special class in Ireland privileged to bear arms, the least we can ask is that they should buy their ammunition at the ordinary price and in the ordinary way. I strongly object to any exception being made in these respects in favour of Belfast. I object also to the officers of the Army and Militia assisting the members of these Rifle Clubs with their instruction and advice, as well as to the clubs using the Government rifle ranges. I shall not be contradicted when I say that the use and profession of arms in Belfast is quite as extensive as it need be, without these clubs having the priviledge of getting the Queen's ammunition in the manner I have described. If it be proved that this system really exists, I certainly intend to bring forward a Motion in this House with the object of putting an end to it.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I rise to give such information as I have been able to obtain in reply to the inquiries made since the hon. Member for West Belfast was good enough to inform me of his intention to bring this subject forward. I find it has been the practice for many years past to supply Government ammunition to some clubs in Ireland upon payment, and after application has been made to the Lord Lieutenant. The officers in the Army have themselves no discretion in the matter. The Regulation appears to have been laid down in the distant past by the Government in Ireland. I was myself entirely ignorant of the fact—I assume it to be a fact—to which the hon. Gentleman refers, that the practice of the clubs has at any time been carried on at the Government ranges with the assistance of sergeants of the Army or Militia. If the hon. Member will allow this portion of the subject to stand over till to-morrow I will endeavour to communicate to him the result of my inquiries into the matter.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): Many persons are acquainted with the fact that up to as recent a date as 1885 not only has ammunition been supplied to favoured persons in the North of Ireland, but that arms have been sent from the Government stores to the North. This practice of supplying favoured persons in the North of Ireland has been going on ever since the Union; and that, too, not only at less than the cost of production, but altogether without payment. I consider it monstrous that this state of things should be allowed to continue; and I think this House ought to be thankful to the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) for having brought the matter under our cognizance. When we remember the disloyal expressions of those to whom these arms and ammunition of war have been supplied; when we remember the incitements that have been addressed to them; when we know that they have indulged in such expressions as that they would "kick the Queen's Crown into the Boyne;" and when we know that they have used these munitions of war for offensive purposes, I think we are greatly indebted to the hon. Member for having drawn the attention of the Secretary of State for War to this fact. Now, I was greatly struck by one portion of the hon. Member's statement, and that was with regard to Sub-Inspector Warburton and the constables. It would be a very deplorable fact if it should be proved that these men were injured in the performance of their duty, and that by weapons and missiles obtained from the Government stores under such peculiar circumstances; and I am glad to hear from the right hon Gentleman that he will inquire into the circumstances with a view of putting a stop to this very reprehensible practice. If Rifle Clubs in the North of Ireland are to be indulged in the use of arms, let them pay for it themselves; and I believe the statement which my hon. Friend has made will have the effect of checking the facilities which have been afforded to them for getting their ammunition at the cost of the nation.

Mr. SEXTON: I am satisfied for the present, and have no further opposition to offer to the Resolution before the House.

Resolution *agreed to.*

MOTION.

—o—

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH ACT (1885) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Baron Henry De Worms, Bill to amend "The Submarine Telegraph Act, 1885," *ordered* to be brought in by Baron Henry De Worms and Sir James Fergusson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 45.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

[INDEX

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK AND SON, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

VOLUME CCCVIII.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 2, 1886.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW — POST OFFICE — METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE — TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABRAHAM, Mr. W., *Glamorgan, Rhondda*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 712

ABRAHAM, Mr. W., *Limerick, W.*
Army (Army Clothing)—Army Clothing Factory, Pimlico, 1742
Limerick Clothing Factory, 1324
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1445
Inspectors under the Explosives Act—Royal Irish Constabulary, 1738

ACLAND, Mr. C. T. Dyke, *Cornwall, Launceston*
Board of Trade—Harbour Loans, 775

ADDISON, Mr. J. E. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Board of Trade—Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, 552
Burmah—Inundation of Mandalay, 1190
Deeds of Arrangement with Creditors, 662
India (Finance, &c.)—Import Duty on Cotton Goods, 1470
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 498

ADMIRALTY—First Lord (*see* HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F.)

ADMIRALTY—Secretary to (*see* FORWOOD, Mr. A. B.)

ADMIRALTY—Civil Lord (*see* ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E.)

ADMIRALTY — Lord (*see* BERESFORD, Lord C.)

Admiralty—see *Navy*

ADVOCATE, The LORD (*see* MACDONALD, Right Hon. J. H. A.)

Afghan Demarcation Commission
Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 24, 378

Africa (South)—Pondoland—The Pondos
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 30, 784

Africa (West Coast)—Kidnapping on the Niger—Native Reprisals
Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 875

Agricultural Department
  Committee of Council on Agriculture—Hessian Fly, The, Question, Mr. Herbert Gardner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 20, 159
  Allotment Returns—Returns for Unions and Parishes instead of by Counties, Question, Sir John Dorington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Sept* 3, 1187

ALLISON, Mr. R. A., *Cumberland, Eskdale*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 828

Allotments and Small Holdings Bill
(*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 34]

AMBROSE, Mr. W., *Middlesex, Harrow*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 477; Report, 1258

America (South)—Republic of Ecuador—Claims of the Land Company
Question, Mr. J. Howard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 23, 263

ANDERSON, Mr. C. H., *Elgin and Nairn*
  Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1382
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Imports from the Dominion of Canada, 1322
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 931
  Scotland—Questions
    Crofters Holdings Act, 1886—Extension of Act, 789
    Fisheries—Dredging for Mussels in Dornoch Firth, 254
    Fishery Board—Beam-Trawling in the Moray Firth, 1084

Arbitration Courts (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Mason, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, Mr. Watt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 11]

ARGYLL, Duke of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 35, 37

ARMY (*Questions*)
  Age Retirement, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 26, 541
  "*Apprehended Disturbances in England,*" Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 26, 544
  Canteens (Ireland), Questions, Mr. Hooper; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 27, 655; *Sept* 2, 1072
  Commissions in the Royal Artillery and Engineers, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 255
  High Officials in Private Firms, Questions, Colonel Hughes-Hallett, Mr. Woodall; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 3, 1174
  Indian Officials in Private Firms—Sir Donald Stewart, Question, General Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 2, 1083
  Ireland—The Cavalry Regiment at Dundalk, Questions, Mr. J. Nolan; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 31, 892; *Sept* 6, 1309
  Medical Department — The Annual Reports, Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 2, 1065
  Mr. Gustenberg, Lieutenant, 20th Hussars, Question, Sir John Simon; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 2, 1095
  Quartermasters, Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1728
  Regimental Bands at Political Meetings and Public Festivals, Questions, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 24, 370; *Sept* 7, 1480
  Royal Military Asylum—Admission of Soldiers' Children, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 266
  7th Hussars—Suicide of a Sergeant, Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 6, 1311
  The Force in Burmah—Reinforcements, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 23, 266

CLOTHING DEPARTMENT
  Cloth for Army Uniforms, Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 2, 1063

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Clothing Department*—cont.

Contracts—Supply of Army Clothing, Questions, Mr. Hooper, Dr. Tanner, Mr. Mahony; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 26, 534

Limerick Clothing Factory, Question, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 6, 1324

Pimlico Clothing Factory, Questions, Admiral Sir John Commerell, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 9, 1742

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Ammunition — Cartridges, Questions, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1746

Cavalry Saddles, Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 26, 532

Defective Military Weapons, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 23, 269

Cavalry Swords, Pattern 1884, Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 2, 1072

Small Arms—The Swords of the 2nd Dragoon Guards, Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 2, 1077

Manufacture of Arms, Ammunition, &c., Question, Major-General Goldsworthy; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 20, 166; Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 27, 661; Question, Sir Frederick Mappin; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 2, 1093

Guns

Army and Navy Guns, Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1730

Artillery—Complaints as to Quality of Field or Mountain Guns, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 20, 158

Colonel Hope's Gun, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 7, 1463

Heavy Guns, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 30, 783

Manufacture of Nordenfelt Guns at Woolwich, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 26, 555

The 43-ton Guns, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 27, 668

The "Collingwood" 42-ton Gun, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Aug* 23, 254; Questions, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 31, 895; *Sept* 2, 1077

The New 68-ton Gun, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Sept* 2, 1090

Ordnance Committee — Calculated Bursting Strain of Guns, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1753

Charges against the Ordnance Department

Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 20, 159; Questions, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Sir William Crossman, Mr. E. Robertson; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 256; Questions, Sir William Crossman, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 24, 373; Observations, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 26, 563; Withdrawal of Motion, Sir William Crossman *Aug* 27, 654; Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 6, 1322

ARMY (INDIA)

European Cavalry Regiments, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 31, 896

Medical Service, Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 3, 1173;—*Honorary Commissions*, Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 9, 1731

THE AUXILIARY FORCES

The Militia

The Cavan Militia — Colonel Dease — Major Kerr, Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 261;—*Lieutenant W. H. Malcolmson*, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 260;—*Captain Somerset Maxwell*, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 261

The Militia Training—Instruction for Militia Regiments, Question, Mr. Seale-Hayne; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 7, 1459

The Volunteers

The Capitation Grant, Question, Viscount Wolmer; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 23, 257;—Question, Mr. Esslemont; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 3, 1186

Payments to Volunteers in Camp, Question, Colonel Eyre; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1750

Army—*Auxiliary Forces—cont.*
Sergeant Instructors to Volunteer Corps, Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1732

Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. E. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Sheffield, Ecclesall*
Admiralty—Discharge of Workmen at Haulbowline, 371, 372, 546
Works at Haulbowline, 882
Navy Estimates—Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1656, 1664

Asia (North-East)—Rumoured Occupation of Port Lazareff
Question, Mr. Seager-Hunt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 20, 166

Asiatic Russia—The Free Port of Batoum
Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 26, 548

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L., *Durham, N.W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1264

Attorney General (*see* Webster, Sir R. E.)

Attorney General for Ireland (*see* Holmes, Right Hon. H.)

Australasian Colonies
Queensland — Division of the Colony—Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 30, 790
Australia (*Western*)
Discoveries of Gold, Question, Mr. Salt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 9, 1749
Treatment of Natives, Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 2, 1091

Baden-Powell, Mr. G., *Liverpool, Kirkdale*
Board of Trade—Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, 552
Bulgaria—Recent Revolution, 377
Mauritius—Official Dissensions, 561
Railway Rates, 776

Balfour, Right Hon. A. J. (Secretary for Scotland), *Manchester, E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 926, 939, 940, 943, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 952, 970, 984; Report, 1297

[*cont.*

Balfour, Right Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
Scotland—Questions
Agricultural Leases—A Commission of Inquiry, 789
Commissioners of Northern Lights—Want of Lighthouses on the West Coast of Shetland, 881
Crofters Holdings Act, 1884—Extension of Act, 789
Fisheries—Loans to Fishermen in Crofting Districts, 1476
Law and Police—Bye-Laws as to Bicycles and Tricycles, 563
Locomotives Act, 1878—Bye-Laws of Road Trustees, 560, 879
Municipal Elections—Corrupt Practices, 1183
Post Office—Postal Communication with the Outer Hebrides, 889
Universities Bill, 554
Scotland—Fishery Board—Questions
Beam-Trawling in the Moray Firth, 1084
Memorial of Fishery Officers, 1072
Report for 1885 — Fishermen's Houses, 1473

Balfour, Right Hon. J. B., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 969, 970

Balfour, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Army Estimates—Army Reserve Force, 1404, 1408
Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1414
Medical Establishments and Services, 1332, 1342
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1380
Vaccination Acts — Prosecutions — Fees to Clerks of Boards of Guardians, 1471

Balfour, Mr. G. W., *Leeds, Central*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 509, 512

Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill (*Colonel Waring, Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Baden-Powell*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 24 [Bill 38]

Bankruptcy Court (Belfast) Bill (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. Biggar, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Carew*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 9]

Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. M'Cartan*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 10]

Barran, Mr. J., *York, W.R., Otley*
Civil Service Writers, 1468

BARRY, Mr. J., *Wexford, S.*
  Ireland—District Lunatic Asylums—Salary of Officials, 1743

BARTTELOT, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, North-West*
  Army Estimates—Army Reserve Force, 1395
    Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1410
    Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1374
    Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1484
    Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1577
  Bulgaria—Prince Alexander's Return, 795, 898
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 697, 698, 699, 834

BAUMANN, Mr. A. A., *Camberwell, Peckham*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 915, 918, 919, 920, 932, 965
  Post Office—Female Clerks, 559
  School Board Elections—Counting and Declaring the Votes, 1319

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-, (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Bristol, W.*
  Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1623, 1625, 1627
  Ireland—Questions
    Asylums for the Poor—Monaghan Asylum, 1731
    Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Country Fairs, 1465
    Dispensary Districts—Castlebar Dispensary, 1176;—Ely Dispensary, Co. Fermanagh, 884, 1464;—Glengariffe Dispensary, 1462; — Inchigeelagh Dispensary—Medical Relief, 894
    Distress in the West—Mr. Tuke's Report, 548
    Fisheries—Herring Fisheries on the South Coast, 538
    Fishery Piers and Harbours—Culdaff Pier, 1747
    Franchise Acts, 1885—Extra Remuneration to Poor Law Officials, 1180, 1733
    Government of Ireland—Law Advisers to the Lord Lieutenant, 165
    Irish Church Act—Relief of Glebe Purchasers, 1069
    Labourers' Acts, 1883 and 1885—Donaghmore Union Schemes, 1748;—Scheme for Cottages in Macroom Union, 546
    Lunatic Asylums—District Lunatic Asylums—Salaries of Officials, 1744; —Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum, 274, 1472
    Parliamentary Elections—List of Voters, North Leitrim, 1179
    Registration of Voters Act, 1885—Expenses of Preparing Lists—Payment of Officials—Mountbellew Union, 1475
    Representation of the People Act, 1884—Unpaid Extra Remuneration, 1078

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-—*cont.*
    Sea and Coast Fisheries—Loans to Fishermen, 887
    Seeds Act—Repayments, 533
    South-West District—Sir Redvers Buller, 270, 271, 375, 564, 897, 1076
    State of Ireland—Constabulary Force at Millstreet, Co. Cork, 545
    Statistics of Population—Cork Co. 534
  Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Attempted Disturbance at Gilford, Co. Armagh, 656
  Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast—Questions
    557
    Commission, The, 90, 91, 165, 166, 273
    Constabulary (Casualties), 882, 883
    Cypher Telegrams, 1186
    Loss of Employment by Catholic Workpeople, 1726
  Ireland—Evictions—Questions
    Bantry Board of Guardians, 1062, 1063, 1075
    Evictions at Garrison, Co. Fermanagh, 1069, 1070
    Gweedore, Co. Donegal, 265, 266, 1182
    Kildysart Guardians, Co. Clare, 1729
    Kilkenny Co. 1178
    Lord Clanricarde's Woodford Estate, Co. Galway, 669;—County Inspector O'Brien, 884
    Wexford Co. 556, 557
  Ireland—Inland Navigation and Drainage—Drainage of the Bann, 544, 890
    River Barrow, 265
  Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
    A Convict Depôt, Taylor's Hill, Co. Galway, 991
    Administration, 1780
    Crossmaglen Conspiracy — Release of the Conspirators, 1172, 1173
  Ireland—Magistracy—Questions
    Cork Magistrates, 895
    Mr. Gray, of Glenann, Co. Armagh, 656
    Mr. Molony, R.M., Co. Mayo, 1080
    Mr. Sinclair, Newry, 656
  Ireland—National Education—Questions
    Board of Intermediate Education, 538
    Board of National Education—Dimissal of Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald, 1086; — Resignation of Dr. Newell, 1086
    Irish-Speaking Districts, 1478
    National School Teachers Act—Condition of Teachers, 1459
  Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
    Cork Union — Stowaways from Liverpool, 1173
    Newry Union—Poor Rate for the Camlough Division, 1178
    Unsanitary Condition of Rathdown Union Workhouse, 372
  Ireland — Prisons — Maryborough Gaol, Discipline in, 1089, 1090
    Outbreak of Fever, 1089
    Re-organization—Increase of Salaries of Officials, 1477
  Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Questions
    Deductions from Pensions, 1081
    Employment at Evictions, 276
    Expenses of the Royal Hospital, 1727, 1728
    Force in Belfast, 1726, 1727
    Inspectors under the Explosives Act, 1738, 1739
    Numbers and Religious Composition of the Force, 1094, 1458

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1216, 1218
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 587
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 290, 292, 295, 390, 418, 426, 469, 755, 760, 1022, 1023, 1028, 1030, 1041, 1045
Scotland (Fisheries)—The Royal Commission—Trawling in Galway Bay, 1180

Beckett, Mr. W., *Notts, Bassetlaw*
Palace of Westminster — Shelter in Palace Yard, 160

Beer Adulteration Bill (*Mr. Cuthbert Quilter, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Lord Elcho, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Francis Stevenson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 19]

Belfast Government Bill (*Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gray, Mr. Biggar*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 28]

Belfast Main Drainage Bill
Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Aug* 31, 874

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. C., *Whitehaven*
New Police Offices, 277

Beresford, Lord C. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Marylebone, E.*
Admiralty — Channel Squadron — Butterine, 876
Navy Estimates — Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1671, 1675
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1649, 1650

Bethell, Commander G. R., *York, E.R., Holderness*
Navy — Pay of Crews in the China Station — Rate of Exchange, 879, 880
Pay of Seamen—Loss through Depreciation of Silver, 1734
Navy Estimates — Machinery and Ships Built by Contract, 1691
Miscellaneous Services, 1706
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1257

Biggar, Mr. J. G., *Cavan, W.*
Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, 1341
Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1587
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1379, 1392
India (Madras)—The late Princess of Tanjore, 1070

Biggar, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Ireland — Law and Justice — Administration, 1775
Parliament — New Writ — Double Return for Belfast Borough (Western Division) and Sligo County (Southern Division), 168
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 337, 518, 699, 867, 1130, 1143

Birkbeck, Sir E., *Norfolk, E.*
North Sea Fisheries Convention—The Protecting Cruisers, 1629
Speaker, Election of, 4

Blane, Mr. A., *Armagh, S.*
Army Estimates — Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 1600
Militia Pay and Allowances, 1365, 1368, 1369
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1388
India (Madras)—Official Scandals, 1070
Ireland—Questions
Crime and Outrage — Attempted Disturbance at Gilford, Co. Armagh, 655
Law and Justice — The Crossmaglen Conspiracy — Release of the Conspirators, 1172
Magistracy — Mr. Sinclair, Newry, 656;—Mr. Gray, of Glenann, Co. Armagh, 656
Poor Law—Newry Union — Poor Rate for the Camlough Division, 1178
Royal Irish Constabulary—Head Constable Magee, 775
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 609, 611, 823, 981, 982

Blundell, Colonel H. B. H., *Lancashire, S.W., Ince*
Army Estimates — Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c., 1424
Militia Pay and Allowances, 1348
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1387
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1554
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 592

Board of Trade — Secretary to (*see* De Worms, Baron H.)

Board of Trade
Harbour Loans, Question, Mr. C. T. D. Acland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 30, 775
The Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, Questions, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Addison, Mr. Baden-Powell; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms), Mr. Mundella *Aug* 26, 551

Bonsor, Mr. H. C. O., *Surrey, Wimbledon*
Endowed Schools (England and Wales)—Removal of Christ's Hospital, 785

[*cont.*

Borlase, Mr. W. C., *Cornwall, St. Austell*
Poor Law (England and Wales) — Launceston Board of Guardians—Education of Children in a Public Elementary School, 1315

Bradlaugh, Mr. C., *Northampton*
Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, 1345
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1492
Church of England—The Tithe War in Wales, 254
Law and Justice — Street Speaking — Case of John Williams, 1460
Mauritius—Thomas Wilkinson, 367
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1634
Navy Estimates — Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c., 1685
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1658
Parliament — Business of the House — Precedence of Government Orders — Motions on Perpetual Pensions, &c., 795
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 304, 526, 865
Parliament — Sessional Orders—Interference of Peers in Elections, 73, 80
Scotland—Contravention of the Truck Act, 1083, 1764, 1769

Bridgeman, Colonel Hon. F., *Bolton*
Cyprus—The Annual Tribute, 541

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester, S.W.*
Spain—Commercial Tariff — "Certificates of Origin," 891

British North America—Confederation of the Provinces—Nova Scotia
Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 9, 1723

Brodrick, Hon. W. St. J. F. (Financial Secretary, War Department), *Surrey, Guildford*
Army Estimates—Military Education, Establishments for, 1583, 1585
Militia Pay and Allowances, 1368
Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1591
Out-Pensions, 1601
War Office, 1595

Brookfield, Colonel A. M., *Sussex, Rye*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1389
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1274

Brown, Mr. A. L., *Hawick, &c.*
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. 1212, 1215
Supply, Report, 1604, 1606

Bruce, Lord H., *Wilts, Chippenham*
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast —Cypher Telegrams, 1185

Bryce, Mr. J., *Aberdeen, S.*
Asia (Central) — Afghan Boundary Commission, 378, 1326
Bulgaria—Recent Revolution, 378
Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1326
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 821
Turkey—Disturbances in Armenia (Van), 539

Buchanan, Mr. T. R., *Edinburgh, W.*
Burmah—Government of India Act, Sec. 27, 792
Military Expedition—Appointment of Commander-in-Chief, 562
England and China—Treaty regarding Burmah, 562
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 803
Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1812

Bulgaria—See *Europe* (*South-Eastern*)

Burials (*England and Wales*) — *The Churchyard at Bolton-on-Dearne, Yorkshire*
Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 30, 777

Burmah
Administration of Justice—Captain Adamson, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 3, 1184
Government of India Act, 1858, *Sec.* 27, Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 30, 792
Inundation of Mandalay, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 26, 542; Question, Mr. Addison; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 3, 1190
Public Works—Railways, Questions, Mr. Dalrymple; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 26, 553
The Chief Boshway, Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 2, 1093
The Military Expedition — Appointment of Commander-in-Chief, Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 26, 562
The Cost, Question, Mr. James Stuart; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 26, 547

Burt, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
Coal Mines—Woodend Colliery Explosion, 258
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 839
Spain—Fernando Po — Expulsion of the Rev. William Welford, 877

Butter Substitutes Bill (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Lalor, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.), Mr. Hooper, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Biggar, Dr. Tanner*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 13]

Buxton, Mr. S. C., *Tower Hamlets, Poplar*
Metropolitan Police Force—Summer Clothing, 1740
Poor Law — Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1870—Metropolis Common Poor Fund, 1084
Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1809

Byrne, Mr. G. M., *Wicklow, W.*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1387

Cadogan, Earl (Lord Privy Seal)
Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—The Riots at Belfast—Return of Casualties, Motion for a Return, 1060
Leaseholders (Ireland), Res. 1717

Caldwell, Mr. J., *Glasgow, St. Rollox*
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1761
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 597
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 438
Scotland—Contravention of the Truck Act, 1772
Universities, 554

Cameron, Dr. C., *Glasgow, College*
Burmah—Administration of Justice—Captain Adamson, 1184, 1185
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1280, 1282, 1288, 1289
Scotland—Law and Justice—Death by Drowning of Donald Macnab, 1314
Southern Pacific, Islands of—Island of Malayta —H.M.S. "Opal"—Reprisals on Natives, 1314
Western Pacific, Islands of—H.M.S. "Diamond"—Reprisals on Natives, 1313

Cameron, Mr. J. M., *Wick, &c.*
Army—7th Hussars—Suicide of a Sergeant, 1311
Post Office—Mails in Sutherland, 1071
Scotland—Fishery Board—Memorial of Fishery Officers, 1071

Campbell, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Army — Force in Burmah — Reinforcements, 267
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 820
Post Office—Rates for Telegrams to the Continent, 1720

Campbell, Mr. H., *Fermanagh, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1130, 1133

Campbell-Bannerman, Right Hon. H., *Stirling, &c.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1355
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1563

Canada and the United States—The Fishery Disputes—The Treaty of 1871
Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 20, 160; *Aug* 30, 775; *Sept* 9, 1721

Carew, Mr. J. L., *Kildare, N.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Country Fairs (Ireland), 1465

Carnarvon, Earl of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 51

Central Asia — The Afghan Boundary Commission
Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 6, 1326

Chamberlain, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham, W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 614, 620, 621, 626, 627, 628, 632, 633, 641, 648

Chance, Mr. P. A., *Kilkenny, S.*
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, Motion for Leave, 484
Ireland—Evictions—Kilkenny Co. 1178
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 737

Chancellor of the Exchequer (*see* Churchill, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S.)

Chancellor, The Lord (*see* Halsbury, Lord)

Channing, Mr. F. A., *Northampton, E.*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1389
Australia (Western)—Treatment of Natives, 1091
Railway Accidents — Penistone Accident — Brakes on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, 1466
Supply—Home Office, 1835

Chaplin, Right Hon. H., *Lincolnshire, Sleaford*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 441, 452, 454, 693, 694, 736

Charity Commissioners, The
Schemes of the Charity Commissioners, Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 9, 1741

[*cont.*

Charity Commissioners, The—cont.
  Trustees of Goodfellow's Charity, Fifehead, Neville, Dorset, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 24, 376

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Edinburgh, S.*
  Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1444

China
  Chefoo Convention, The—The Anglo-Chinese Convention, Pekin, Question, Mr. King; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 890
  Franco-Chinese Commercial Treaty—Prohibition of Opium Traffic between Tonquin and China, Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 3, 1184
  Smuggling in China—The Chefoo Agreement, Clause 9, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 6, 1310

China and Burmah
  Trade in Opium, Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 9, 1743

China and England
  Treaty Regarding Burmah, Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 26, 562

CHURCHILL, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S. (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *Paddington, S.*
  Army Estimates, 1327; — Warlike Stores, 1525, 1562
  Currency — Appointment of a Commission, 1320;—Names of Members, 1479
    Gold Coinage, 1724
  Customs Estimates—Surveyor of the Port of London, 1738
  Fiscal Laws — Duties on Imported Manufactures, 369
  Inland Revenue — Repayment of Income Tax, 782
  Ireland—Questions
    Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill, 797, 897
    Hospitals and Infirmaries — The Royal Hospital, Belfast, 1772
    Inland Navigation and Drainage — The River Barrow, 265
  Local Government Bill — Licences for Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, 161
  Mechanics' Institutes — Supply of Parliamentary Reports, 1722
  Metropolis—Poor Ratepayers of London, 1753
  Minister of Education — Report of Commons Committee, 1884, 1734
  Parliament—Committee on Procedure, 159
    House of Commons Arrangements — A Select Committee, 881

CHURCHILL, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S.—*cont.*
  Parliament—Business of the House—Questions 89, 1095, 1755
    Bills of Private Members, 167
    Duration of the Session, 89
    Hours of Commencement, 169
    Precedence of Government Orders — Motions on Perpetual Pensions, &c., 796
    Votes in Supply, 91
  Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for the Address, 382
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1195, 1201, 1224
  Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 573, 575, 579
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 113, 123, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 201, 202, 222, 346, 413, 415, 418, 482, 651, 737, 857, 860, 861, 872, 990, 1108, 1149, 1151; Report, 1163, 1166, 1170, 1171, 1233, 1243
  Parliament—Sessional Orders — Interference of Peers at Elections, 80
  Public Accounts Committee—Secret Service Money, 667
  Rivers Pollution (River Lea), Motion for Re-appointment of Select Committee, 249
  Supply—Civil Service Commission, 1843, 1845
    Exchequer and Audit Department, 1845
    House of Commons Offices, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1822
    House of Lords Offices, 1795, 1808, 1810, 1812
    Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1839
  Town Holdings, Motion for Re-appointment of Select Committee, 250
  Trade and Agriculture, Royal Commission on—Foreign Bounties, 781

Civil Service Clerks and Writers
  Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 7, 1468; Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), 1478
  Report of the Departmental Committee, Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 23, 257; Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 9, 1725

CLANCY, Mr. J. J., *Dublin Co., N.*
  Army Estimates — Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c., 1419
  Ireland—Questions
    Education—Board of Intermediate Education, 537
    Fisheries—Herring Fisheries on the South Coast, 538
    Parliamentary Elections — Assistant Revising Barristers, 531
    Piers and Harbours—Unexpended Grants, 1736
    Sea and Coast Fisheries—Loans to Fishermen, 887
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 144, 1125
  Supply — Civil Service Commission, 1844, 1845
    Home Office, 1832, 1838

[cont.

CLARK, Dr. G. B., *Caithness*
Life Insurance Companies—Return of Accounts, 1190
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 860, 909, 910, 911, 918, 919, 943, 947, 949, 952; Report, 1288, 1289, 1290, 1295, 1296, 1297
Post Office—Acceleration of the Scotch Mails, 377
Scotland—Contravention of the Truck Act, 1771
Truck Acts—Easdale Slate Company, 161
Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1812

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 15]
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *Sept* 1, 1053

Coal Mines—The Woodend Colliery Explosion
Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 23, 258

COBB, Mr. H. P., *Warwick, S.E., Rugby*
Law and Justice—"Bryce *v.* Rusden," 791

COCHRANE-BAILLIE, Hon. C. W. A. N., *St. Pancras, N.*
Post Office—Country Telegrams, 1186
Railways—Safety Railway Couplings, 1750

COHEN, Mr. L. L., *Paddington, N.*
Foreign Official Passport Agencies, 262
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 435, 863

COLLINGS, Mr. J., *Birmingham, Bordesley*
Charity Commissioners — Trustees of Goodfellow's Charity, Co. Dorset, 376

COLOMB, Capt. J. C. R., *Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1576
Works, Buildings, &c., at Home and Abroad, 1582
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1164

COLONIES—Secretary of State for (*see* STANHOPE, Right Hon. E.)

Colonies, The—Imperial Federation—see *United Kingdom*

COMMERELL, Admiral Sir J. E., *Southampton*
Army (Clothing Department)—Army Clothing Factory, Pimlico, 1742

COMMERELL, Admiral Sir J. E.—*cont.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1358
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1520, 1523, 1569
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1635
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1689
Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1674
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1650

COMMINS, Dr. A., *Roscommon, S.*
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 588
Parliament — Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1136

COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—Vice President (*see* HOLLAND, Right Hon. Sir H. T.)

Contagious Diseases (*Animals*)
Country Fairs (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1465
Imports from the Dominion of Canada, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Sept* 6, 1322
Splenetic Blood Poisoning at Arnesby, Leicestershire, Question, Mr. Tapling; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Sept* 7, 1467
Swine Fever — Inoculation, Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 30, 777

CONWAY, Mr. M., *Leitrim, N.*
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1757, 1764
Ireland — Parliamentary Elections — List of Voters—North Leitrim, 1179
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1700
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 985

CONYBEARE, Mr. C. A. V., *Cornwall, Camborne*
Indian Telegraph Department—Grievances of Officers, 271
Ireland (South-Western District) — Special Military Officer in Command, 793, 794
Statistics of Population—Cork Co. 534
Law and Justice—Irregular Detention at the Middlesex Sessions, 1088
Navy—Engine Room Artificers, 271, 560
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 223, 228, 229, 844, 847, 862
Town Holdings, Motion for Re-appointment of Select Committee, 250

COOKE, Mr. C. W. R., *Newington, W.*
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—Ventilation of the House, 554
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 309

[*cont.*

CORBET, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow, E.*
Ireland—Inland Navigation and Drainage—The River Barrow, 265
Port of Dublin—Great Eastern Steamship, 1066

CORRY, Sir J. P., *Armagh, Mid*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 995, 1129, 1130

COSSHAM, Mr. H., *Bristol, E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 423

COTTON, Capt. E. T. D., *Cheshire, Wirral*
Army—Small Arms—Swords of the 2nd Dragoon Guards, 1077
Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, 1337
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—Electric Communication in the House, 1076

County Government (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Maurice Healy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 29]

COURTNEY, Mr. L. H. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Cornwall, Bodmin*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1349
Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1591
Retired Pay, &c. 1596, 1597
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1531, 1547
War Office, 1591, 1592
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1700, 1705
Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1667, 1668, 1674
Miscellaneous Services, 1709, 1853
Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c. 1676, 1677, 1678
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1650, 1651, 1658, 1660, 1663
Secret Service (Repeal), Comm. *cl.* 1, 1304
Supply—Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade, 1842
Home Office, 1830
House of Commons Offices, 1818
House of Lords Offices, 1803, 1812

COX, Mr. J. R., *Clare, E.*
Railways — Railway Bookstalls — Boycotting of Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet, 1480

CRANBORNE, Viscount, *Lancashire, N.E., Darwen*
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1762
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 605

CRAWFORD, Mr. D., *Lanark, N.E.*
Scotland—Contravention of the Truck Act, 1770

CREMER, Mr. W. R., *Shoreditch, Haggerston*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. 806, 869

CRILLY, Mr. D., *Mayo, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 500

CROSSMAN, Major General Sir W., *Portsmouth*
Army—Charges against the Ordnance Department, 159, 256, 373, 374, 654
Indian Officials in Private Companies—Sir Donald Stewart, 1083

Currency, The
Appointment of a Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 6, 1319;—*Names of Members,* Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 7, 1479
The Gold Coinage, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1724

Customs Estimates—Surveyor of the Port of London
Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1737

Cyprus—The Annual Tribute
Question, Colonel Bridgeman; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 26, 541

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Ipswich*
Burmah—Public Works—Railways, 553, 554
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 928

DEASY, Mr. J., *Mayo, W.*
Navy Estimates—Miscellaneous Services, 1854
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1658, 1659, 1663

Deeds of Arrangement with Creditors—Legislation
Question, Mr. Addison; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 27, 662

DE LA WARR, Earl
Bulgaria — Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1710
Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—Riots at Belfast—Return of Casualties, Motion for a Return, 1058, 1061
Malta — Dockyards—Employment of Maltese Subjects, 1307, 1712

DE LISLE, Mr. E. J. L. M. Phillipps, *Leicestershire, Mid*
Admiralty—Medals to the Sailors and Naval Officers in Egyptian and Soudan Campaigns, 783
Army (Ammunition)—Cartridges, 1746

DENMAN, Lord
Women's Suffrage, 2R. 1054

DE ROS, Lord (Lord in Waiting)
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 26, 33

DE WORMS, Baron H. (Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Liverpool, East Toxteth*
Board of Trade—Harbour Loans, 775
  Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, 552
Deeds of Arrangement with Creditors, 662
Gold and Silver Hall-Marking, 275
Ireland—Questions
  Commissioners of Irish Lights—Attendance of Lightkeepers at Divine Service, 558
  Dublin Port—Dues on Fishing Boats, 372, 1082;—Great Eastern Steamship, 1066
  Railways—Girvan and Portpatrick Railway, 1322
Law of Trade Marks—The International Industrial Convention, 368
Life Insurance Companies—Return of Accounts, 1190
Merchant Shipping — Fishing Boats Acts Amendment, 255
Patent Office—Committee of Inquiry, 1064
Railways—Questions
  Metropolis—Bridge on the North London Line, 1324
  Mixed Trains—Continuous Brakes, 1177
  Railway Accidents—Penistone Accident—Brakes on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, 1467
  Railway Charges—The Return, 273
  Railway Rates, 776
  Safety Railway Couplings, 1750
Sugar Bounties (Abolition)—An International Conference, 1064
Supply—Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade, 1840, 1841

DILLON, Mr. J., *Mayo, E.*
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1621
Ireland—Questions
  Dispensary Districts—Castlebar Dispensary, 1175
  Law and Justice—Administration, 1776
  Magistracy—Mr. Molony, R.M., Co. Mayo, 1080
  South-Western District — Sir Redvers Buller, 667
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. Amendt. 1201, 1218, 1227
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 592, 596
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 518, 1039, 1041, 1045
Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1810, 1811

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L., *Swansea Town*
Africa (South)—Pondoland—The Pondos, 784
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, Motion for Adjournment, 1169
Wales (North)—Collection of Tithes, 551

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *Aug* 24, 482; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 35]
  Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 30, 797; Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 31, 897
  2R. deferred, after short debate *Sept* 6, 1456
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Sept* 7, 1607; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. E. Harrington*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
  Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Divorce (Law of Evidence Amendment) Bill (*Mr. Henry Howorth, Mr. Gent-Davis, Mr. R. Mowbray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 20]

DORINGTON, Sir J. E., *Gloucester, Tewkesbury*
Agricultural Department — The Allotment Returns—Returns for Unions and Parishes instead of by Counties, 1187

DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS- (Secretary to the Treasury), *Kent, St. Augustine's*
Speaker, Election of, 12

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1551
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1640, 1641
Navy Estimates — Miscellaneous Services, 1706
  Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1659
Scotland—Fishery Board—Report for 1885—Fishermen's Houses, 1473

DUNCAN, Colonel F., *Finsbury, Holborn*
Army—Charges against the Ordnance Department, 1322
  Quartermasters, 1728
Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, 1328

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H. *Kent, Dartford*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 386, 723, 726

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND AND WALES)
A Minister of Education—Report of Commons Committee, 1884, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1733
Endowed Schools—Removal of Christ's Hospital, Question, Mr. Bonsor; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 30, 785
Inspection of Welsh Schools—Inspectors' Reports, 1884-5, Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 6, 1317
Intermediate and Higher Education (Wales), Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 9, 1747
Schemes of the Charity Commissioners, Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 9, 1741
School Accommodation in the Metropolitan Districts, Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 30, 776
School Board Elections—Counting and Declaring the Votes, Question, Mr. Baumann; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 6, 1319

Education (Grants to Schools)
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Sept* 9, To leave out from "That," add "this House is of opinion that it is expedient that every school conducted in suitable premises, with an attendance of not less than thirty scholars, under a duly certified teacher or teachers, and complying with the other provisions of the Code, and favourably reported on by Her Majesty's Inspector as being efficiently taught, shall be entitled to a share in the annual Parliamentary Grant for Public Education" (*Mr. Conway*) *v.*, 1757; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Egypt
British Trade with the Soudan, Question, Mr. Jennings; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 2, 1085
The Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops at Assouan, Question, Mr. R. G. Webster; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 9, 1739

Electric Lighting Provisional Order Bill
(*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° * *Aug* 26 [Bill 278]
Read 2° * *Aug* 30
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Sept* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Sept* 6 (No. 13)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 9

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Read 1ª *; read 2ª; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Aug* 30 (No. 96)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 30 [Bill 272]
Report * *Sept* 3
Read 3° * *Sept* 6

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Read 1ª *; read 2ª; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Aug* 30 (No. 97)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 30 [Bill 273]
Report * *Sept* 3
Read 3° * *Sept* 6

ELLIOT, Hon. H. F. H., *Ayrshire, N.*
Railways (Ireland)—Girvan and Portpatrick Railway, 1321

ELLIS, Mr. J. E., *Nottingham, Rushcliffe*
Army—"Apprehended Disturbances in England," 544
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 582, 584
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1167
Portsmouth and Hayling Railway, Consid. 1061, 1062
Railway Charges—The Return, 273
Registration of Parliamentary Voters, 1191

ELLIS, Mr. T. E., *Merionethshire*
Education Department—Inspection of Welsh Schools — Inspectors' Reports, 1884-5, 1317
Intermediate and Higher Education (Wales), 1747

Emigration—The Emigrants' Information Bureau
Question, Mr. Rankin; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 26, 546

Employers' Liability Bill
(*Colonel Nolan, Mr. Burt, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 2]

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lockwood*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 17]

England and China—Treaty Regarding Burmah
Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 26, 562

Esmonde, Sir T. H. G., *Dublin Co., S.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — Cavan Militia — Lieutenant W. H. Malcolmson, 260
  Ordnance Department — Colonel Hope's Gun, 1463
Army Estimates — Militia Pay and Allowances, 1357, 1361
British North American Provinces—The Confederation—Nova Scotia, 1723
Ireland—Questions
  Dispensaries — Ely Dispensary, Co. Fermanagh, 883
  Dublin Port — Dues on Fishing Boats, 372, 1082
  Kingstown "Bird's Nest"—Detention of Children, 1724
  Piers and Harbours — East Pier of Kingstown, 882
  Poor Law—Unsanitary Condition of the Rathdown Union Workhouse, 372
  Post Office—Telegraphic Department—Miss B. Duffy, 887
  Royal Irish Constabulary — Deductions from Pensions, 1081
Medical Acts — Unregistered Medical Practitioners, 1082
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 141; Motion for Adjournment, 482, 486
Pharmacy Act, 1868 — Prescriptions by Chemists, 1188
Scotland — Fisheries — Royal Commission — Trawling in Galway Bay, 1180
West India Islands—Dominica, 656
West Indian Colonies — A Royal Commission, 540

Esslemont, Mr. P., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Capitation Grant to the Volunteers, 1186
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 869; Amendt. 898
Scotland — Agricultural Leases—A Commission of Inquiry, 788, 789

Europe (South-Eastern)
Contemplated Partition, Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 7, 1475
Bulgaria
Recent Revolution, Questions, Mr. Baden-Powell, Mr. Bryce, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 24, 377; —*Prince Alexander*, Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 27, 670
Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, Questions, Sir Richard Temple, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 26, 549
Prince Alexander's Return, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 30, 795; *Aug* 31, 898
Alleged Ill-treatment of Prince Alexander, Question, Mr. W. A. Macdonald; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 888

[*cont.*

Europe (South-Eastern)—Bulgaria—cont.
Message of Prince Alexander to the Czar, Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 3, 1195
Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson): Question, Sir Henry Tyler [no reply] *Sept* 6, 1326; Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Earl of Iddesleigh); Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Reply, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Earl of Iddesleigh) *Sept* 9, 1710;—*Abdication of Prince Alexander*, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 9, 1748

Evictions (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Stack, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sexton, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Finucane, Mr. O'Doherty*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 26]

Ewart, Mr. W., *Belfast, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1046, 1047

Explosives Act, Inspectors under the—The Royal Irish Constabulary
Question, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1738

Eyre, Colonel H., *Lincolnshire, Gainsborough*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Payments to Volunteers in Camp, 1750

Farquharson, Dr. R., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
Army Medical Department—Annual Report, 1065

Farquharson, Mr. H. R., *Dorset, W.*
Payment of Tithes, 794

Fenwick, Mr. C., *Northumberland, Wansbeck*
Magistracy (England and Wales)—The Somerset Magistracy, 664
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1251

Fergusson, Right Hon. Sir J. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Manchester, N.E.*
Africa (West Coast)—Kidnapping on the Niger—Native Reprisals, 876
Asia (Central)—Afghan Boundary Commission, 378, 1326
Bulgaria—Questions
  Abdication of Prince Alexander, 549, 670, 1326, 1748
  Alleged Ill-treatment of Prince Alexander, 889

[*cont.*

Fergusson, Right Hon. Sir J.—*cont.*
  Message of Prince Alexander to the Czar, 1195
  Prince Alexander's Return, 795, 898
  Revolution, 378
Canada and the United States — The Fishery Disputes, 161, 775;—Treaty of 1871, 1721
China — Chefoo Convention — Anglo-Chinese Convention, Pekin, 890
  Clause 9—Smuggling in China, 1310
China and Burmah—Trade in Opium, 1743
Egypt—British Trade with the Soudan, 1085
England and China—Treaty regarding Burmah, 563
Finance, &c.—Taxation on Personal Property in France, &c. 779
Foreign Official Passport Agencies, 262
France—Questions
  Agricultural and Industrial Classes, 877
  Arrest of Mr. Farren, A British Subject, 1752
  Summary Removal of Rev. W. J. Drought, 779
Franco-Chinese Commercial Treaty—Prohibition of Opium Traffic between Tonquin and China, 1184
Japan—Concessions to German Traders, 659
Northern Pacific—Occupation of Port Hamilton, 1476
Republic of Ecuador — Claims of the Land Company, 263
Russia—Ill-treatment of an M.P. at Moscow, 264
  Rumoured Occupation of Port Lazareff, 166
South-Eastern Europe—Contemplated Partition, 1476
Spain—Questions
  Commercial Tariff — "Certificates of Origin," 891
  Fernando Po—Expulsion of the Rev. William Welford, 877
  The "Mary Mark" Collision," 1463
Supply—Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1838
Treaty of Berlin—Article LIX—Batoum, 548, 897
Turkey—Disturbances in Armenia (Van), 539
Venezuela—Seizure of the Ships "Henrietta" and "Josephine" — Claims of British Subjects, 379
  Trade with the United States, 790

Field, Admiral E., *Sussex, Eastbourne*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1493, 1504, 1512
Navy—Questions
  Education of Junior Executive Officers—Admiral Luard's Committee, 1749
  H.M.S. "Imperiéuse," 162
  H.M.S. "Phaeton," 1193, 1195
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1686
  Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, 1676, 1677
  Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1660

Fiji—Decrease of Population and Trade
Question, Mr. Henniker-Heaton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 23, 267

Finance, &c.
Imperial Taxation on Real and Realized Personal Property, Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 30, 778
Taxation on Personal Property in France, &c., Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 30, 778
The Fiscal Laws—Duties on Imported Manufactures, Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 24, 369

Fitzgerald, Mr. R. U. P., *Cambridge*
Navy Estimates—Miscellaneous Services, 1850

FitzWygram, General Sir F. W., *Hants, Fareham*
Army Estimates — Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1410
  Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1558

Flynn, Mr. J. C., *Cork, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 244, 602, 603, 982, 983, 984

Foreign Affairs—Secretary of State (*see* Iddesleigh, Earl of)

Foreign Affairs—Under Secretary of State (*see* Fergusson, Right Hon. Sir J.)

Foreign Official Passport Agencies
Question, Mr. Lionel Cohen; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 23, 262

Forwood, Mr. A. B. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Lancashire, Ormskirk*
Navy—Admiralty—Contracts for Pork and Butter, 1068
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1642
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c., 1680, 1681, 1683

Fowler, Right Hon. Henry H., *Wolverhampton, E.*
Law and Justice (Ireland) — Administration, 1778
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 623
Supply—Home Office, 1831
  House of Lords Offices, 1805
  Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1838
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1791

France
Agricultural and Industrial Classes, Question, Mr. F. S. Powell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 877

[*cont.*

France—cont.
Arrest of Mr. Farren, a British Subject, Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 9, 1751
Summary Removal of Rev. W. J. Drought, Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. E. Robertson: Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 30, 779

Franco-Chinese Commercial Treaty—Prohibition of Opium Traffic between Tonquin and China
Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 3, 1184

Fraser, Major-Gen. C. C., *Lambeth, N.*
Army Estimates—Army Reserve Force, 1394
Medical Establishments and Services, 1339
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1571

Friendly Societies, Registration of — The Registrar
Question, Sir Albert Rollit; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 3, 1183

Fulton, Mr. J. Forrest, *West Ham, N.*
Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Deficient Arrangements at West Ham, 1740

Gardner, Mr. H., *Essex, Saffron Walden*
Agriculture, Committee on—The Hessian Fly, 159

Gas Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 214]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Sept* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*L. Stanley of Preston*) *Sept* 7 (No. 16)

Gent-Davis, Mr. R., *Lambeth, Kennington*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 442, 460, 734, 847; Report, 1297

Gilhooly, Mr. J., *Cork, W.*
Army Estimates — Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1389
Ireland—Questions
Evictions — Bantry Board of Guardians, 1062, 1063, 1074;—Employment of Gunboats for Conveyance of Legal Officials, 1325
Law and Justice—Administration, 1786;—Shooting at the Person—Case of Denis Murphy, 1176, 1177
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, 1700, 1704, 1705
Miscellaneous Services, 1709
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1662

Gill, Mr. H. J., *Limerick*
Post Office (Ireland)—Limerick Post Office—Salaries of the Letter Carriers and Clerks, 659, 660

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *Edinburgh, Mid Lothian*
Parliament—Speaker, Election of, 6
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 103, 295, 386, 405, 410, 413, 415, 418, 426
Parliament—Sessional Orders — Interference of Peers at Elections, 83

Goldsmid, Sir J., *St. Pancras, S.*
Army—Charges against the Ordnance Department, 256
Civil Service Writers—Report of the Departmental Committee, 257
Education — School Accommodation in the Metropolitan Districts, 776
Mauritius — Sir John Pope Hennessy and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, 662
Post Office—Postage of Circulars, 1179

Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T., *Hammersmith*
Army — Manufacture of Arms, Ammunition, &c., 166
Army Estimates — Medical Establishments and Services, 1346
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1574

Gorst, Sir J. E. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Chatham*
Army — Force in Burmah — Reinforcements, 267
Army (India)—European Cavalry Regiments, 896
Indian Medical Service, 1174;—Honorary Commissions, 1731
Burmah—Questions
Administration of Justice—Captain Adamson, 1185
Government of India Act, Sec. 27, 792
Inundation of Mandalay, 542, 1191
Military Expedition—The Cost, 547;—Appointment of Commander-in-Chief, 562
Public Works—Railways, 553, 554
The Chief Boshway, 1093
India—Questions
Administration of India—A Royal Commission, 1474
Annual Removal of the Local Governments to Hill Stations, 375, 547;—Transfer of the Seat of Government to Simla, 1751
Bombay — Case of Mr. A. Morton, Public Works Department, 537
Finance, &c. — Import Duty on Cotton Goods, 1470
Forest Service—Pensions, 888
Indian Officials in Private Companies—Sir Donald Stewart, 1083
Indian Telegraph Department—Grievances of Officers, 271
Liabilities of Trustees—Indian Guaranteed Railway Shares, 1750

[*cont.*

Gorst, Sir J. E.—*cont.*
- India (Madras)—Questions
  - Land Union in Tanjore — Land Tax in Madras, 1745
  - Late Princess of Tanjore, 1071
  - Official Scandals, 1070
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 809; Report, 1287, 1288

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
- Canada and the United States — The Fishery Disputes, 160, 775;—Treaty of 1871, 1721
- Navy—Mediterranean Squadron, 658
  - Returns of Ships of War, 1635
- West Indian Colonies and the United States—A Commercial Treaty, 1722

Granville, Earl
- Parliament—Business of the House, 22
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 28, 33, 37

Gray, Mr. C. W., *Essex, Maldon*
- Law and Justice (Ireland) — Administration, 1778, 1779
- Poor Law (England and Wales) — Married Couples in Union Workhouses, 1181

Gray, Mr. E. Dwyer, *Dublin, St. Stephen's Green*
- Ireland—Board of Works—Loan for a National School, Miltown Malbay, 1081
- Post Office—Telephone Companies, 1073, 1074

Haldane, Mr. R. B., *Haddington*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 151

Hall-Marking—Gold and Silver Wares
- Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) *Aug* 23, 274

Halsbury, Lord (Lord Chancellor)
- Parliament—Questions
  - Election of Representative Peers for Scotland, 21
  - Opening of, 2, 3
  - Roll of the Lords, 873
  - Speaker of the House of Commons, 13, 14
- Women's Suffrage, 2R. 1057

Hamilton, Right Hon. Lord G. F. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Middlesex, Ealing*
- Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1531, 1546
- Ireland—Evictions—Employment of Gunboats for Conveyance of Legal Officials, 1326
- Navy—Questions
  - Breech-loading Guns, 269, 663
  - Contracts—Supplies for Mess Pork, 883
  - Dockyards—Works at Haulbowline, 1318
  - Gun Practice at Southsea—Recovery of Shot, 894
  - H.M.S. "Impérieuse," 162
  - H.M.S. "Phaeton," 1194, 1195

Hamilton, Right Hon. Lord G. F.—*cont.*
  - Medals to the Sailors and Naval Officers in the Egyptian and Soudan Campaigns, 783
  - Mediterranean Squadron, 658
  - Ordnance—The 38-ton Guns of H.M.S. "Ajax," 163;—The 43-ton Guns, 669
  - Returns of Ships of War, 1637, 1639
- Navy—Admiralty—Questions
  - Access to Confidential Designs of Ships, 1193
  - Education of Junior Executive Officers—Admiral Luard's Committee, 1749
  - Engine Room Artificers, 271, 561
  - Freeing of Haslar Bridge, Portsmouth, 1187
  - Mr. W. H. White, Naval Constructor and Controller, 791
  - Naval Schoolmasters' Pensions, 1754
  - Pay of Crews on the China Station—Rate of Exchange, 880
  - Roman Catholic Chaplains on Board Troopships, 1192, 1323
  - State of Europe—Reduction of the Dockyard Establishments, 1743
- Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships Built by Contract, &c. 1693, 1696, 1705
  - Martial Law, 1705
  - Medicines and Medical Stores, 1847
  - Miscellaneous Services, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1848, 1851, 1855
  - Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c. 1676, 1685, 1686
  - Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1656, 1658, 1662, 1666, 1667
- North Sea Fisheries Convention—The Protecting Cruisers, 1630
- Parliament — Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 352
- South Pacific, Islands of the—Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal"—Reprisals on Natives, 1314
- Supply—Exchequer and Audit Department, 1845
- Western Pacific, Islands of the—H.M.S. "Diamond"—Reprisals on Natives, 1313

Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V., *Derby*
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1207, 1217, 1218
- Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 577, 579
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 185, 190, 193, 194, 195, 201, 202, 292, 652, 719, 735, 737, 738, 744, 1108, 1109, 1146, 1149, 1151, 1152, 1155, 1156, 1157
- Supply — House of Commons Offices, 1818, 1820

Harrington, Mr. E., *Kerry, W.*
- Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1627
- Ireland—Questions
  - Dispensary Districts—Glengariffe, 1461
  - Law and Justice—Administration, 1781, 1785;—Munster Winter Assizes, 1080
  - South-West District—Special Military Officer in Command, 794

HARRINGTON, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships Built by Contract, &c. 1698
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1035, 1255

HARRINGTON, Mr. T. C., *Dublin, Harbour*
Ireland—Evictions—Wexford Co. 556
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 598

HARRIS, Lord (Under Secretary of State for War)
Malta—Dockyards—Employment of Maltese Subjects, 1713

HARRIS, Mr. M., *Galway, E.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1366
Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1590, 1591
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1378
War Office, 1591, 1592
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1764
Ireland—Evictions—Lord Clanricarde's Woodford Estate, Co. Galway, 669
Registration of Voters Act, 1885—Expenses of Preparing Lists—Payment of Officials—Mountbellew Union, 1475
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 136, 428, 429, 430, 516, 517, 518, 527, 938, 939, 940, 946

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of, *Lancashire, Rossendale*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 326

HAYDEN, Mr. L. P., *Leitrim, S.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Administration, 1785
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 209

HAYNE, Mr. C. SEALE-, *Devon, Ashburton*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Militia Training—Instruction for Militia Regiments, 1459
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1349

HEALY, Mr. M., *Cork*
Admiralty—Roman Catholic Chaplains on Board Troopships, 1191, 1192, 1323
Ireland—Questions
Belfast Riots—Charges against the Irish Constabulary, 272;—Trial of Prisoners, 539, 540
Court of Bankruptcy—Compounding Creditors, 1078
Parliamentary Elections—Assistant Revising Barristers, 530, 531
Poor Law—Bantry Board of Guardians, 1063;—Cork Union—Stowaways from Liverpool, 1173
Registration of Voters—Sittings of Court of Revision, Co. Tyrone, 1319

[*cont.*

HEALY, Mr. M.—*cont.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Enniskillen Magistrates—"Queen *v.* James Phair," 657, 658, 891, 892
Munster Winter Assizes, 1079, 1080
Trial of the Walkers (Belfast), 665

HEATH, Mr. A. R., *Lincolnshire, Louth*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 430

HEATON, Mr. J. H., *Canterbury*
Fiji—Decrease of Population and Trade, 267
Treaty of Berlin—Article LIX—Batoum, 896

High Sheriff (Disqualification Removal) (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Alderman John O'Connor* (*Kerry, S.*), *Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. John O'Connor* (*Tipperary, S.*), *Mr. Cox, Mr. Richard Power*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Aug* 20 [Bill 14]

HOLLAND, Right Hon. Sir H. T., (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Hampstead*
Charity Commissioners—Trustees of Goodfellow's Charity, Co. Dorset, 377
Education Department—Questions
Inspection of Welsh Schools—Inspectors' Reports, 1884-5, 1317
Intermediate and Higher Education (Wales), 1747
Schemes of the Charity Commissioners, 1742
School Accommodation in the Metropolitan Districts, 776
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1758
Endowed Schools (England and Wales)—Removal of Christ's Hospital, 785
Medical Acts—Unregistered Medical Practitioners, 1082, 1083
Pharmacy Act, 1868—Prescriptions by Chemists, 1189
School Board Elections—Counting and Declaring the Votes, 1319
Trade and Commerce—Commercial Education, 1309

HOLMES, Right Hon. H. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, Motion for Leave, 482, 484; 2R. 1456, 1617
Ireland—Questions
Court of Bankruptcy — Compounding Debtors, 1079;—Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee, 886
Crime and Outrage—Shooting at the Person — Derrygonnelly, Co. Fermanagh, 1464
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill, 797
Evictions—Action of the Police at Woodford, Co. Galway, 1735;—Lord Clanricarde's Estate, Co. Galway, 1312
Fishery Commissioners—Trawling, 795

[*cont.*

Holmes, Right Hon. H.—*cont.*
- Kingstown "Bird's Nest"—Detention of Children, 1724
- Parliamentary Elections — Assistant Revising Barristers, 531
- Registration of Voters—Sittings of Court of Revision, Co. Tyrone, 1319;—Co. Monaghan, 1321;—Ramelton, Co. Donegal, 1474
- Royal Irish Constabulary—Head Constable Magee, 776;—Veterinary Surgeonship, 1312
- South-West District—The Special Military Officer in Command, 794

Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
- Alleged Assault on Dr. D'Alton, of Branmore, 1736
- Conviction at Millstreet Petty Sessions, 1729
- Enniskillen Magistrates—"Queen *v.* James Phair," 658, 892
- Galway Assizes (Sligo), 532
- Munster Winter Assizes, 1079, 1080
- Shooting at the Person—Case of Denis Murphy, 1176, 1177
- Trial of the Walkers (Belfast), 665
- Woodford Prisoners (Galway), 1752

Ireland—The Riots at Belfast—Questions
- Charges against the Irish Constabulary, 272
- Constable Malone, 1308
- Trial of Prisoners, 539, 540

Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for the Address, 382

Home Department—Secretary of State (*see* **Matthews**, Right Hon. H.)

Home Department—Under Secretary of State (*see* **Wortley**, Mr. C. B. Stuart-)

Hooper, Mr. J., *Cork, S.E.*

Admiralty — The Channel Squadron — Butterine, 876

Army—Questions
- Canteens, 655
- Canteens (Ireland), 1072
- Contracts—Supply of Army Clothing, 534, 1063

Ireland—Questions
- Franchise Act—Remuneration to Clerks of Unions, &c., Kinsale, 1733
- Post Office—Postal Facilities at Kinsale, 1737
- Royal Irish Constabulary—Numbers and Religious Composition of the Force, 1094, 1458

Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 229

Housing of the Working Classes (*England*) *Act*, 1885 — *Site of Coldbath Fields Prison*

Question, Mr. J. Rowlands; Answer, the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 2, 1075

Howard, Mr. J., *Middlesex, Tottenham*

Republic of Ecuador — Claims of the Land Company, 263

Howell, Mr. G., *Bethnal Green, N.E.*

Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 496

Howorth, Mr. H. H., *Salford, South*

Board of Trade—Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, 551

Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 492

South Pacific—Reported Annexation of the Ellice Islands, 268

Howth, Earl of

Leaseholders (Ireland), Res. 1715

Hozier, Mr. J. H. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*

Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1615, 1616, 1617

Hubbard, Right Hon. J. G., *London*

Church of England—Tithe Commutation Act, 1836—"The Tithe War in Wales," 254, 654

Hughes-Hallett, Colonel F. C., *Rochester*

Army—Questions
- Artillery—Complaints as to Quality of Field or Mounted Guns, 158
- High Officials in Private Firms, 1174
- India—European Cavalry Regiments, 896
- War Office—Defective Military Weapons, 269

Army (Ordnance Department)—Questions
- Charges against the Ordnance Department, 373
- Manufacture of Nordenfelt Guns at Woolwich, 555
- 68-ton Gun, 1090

Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, Amendt. 1524, 1551

Navy—Breech-Loading Guns, 269, 663
- Ordnance—"Collingwood" Gun, 1077;—Report on the, 895;—38-ton Gun of H.M.S. "Ajax," 163;—43-ton Gun, 668

Navy—Admiralty—Access to Confidential Designs of Ships, 1193
- Mr. W. H. White, Naval Constructor and Controller, 790

Hunt, Mr. F. S., *Marylebone, W.*

Russia — Rumoured Occupation of Port Lazareff, 166

Hunter, Mr. W. A., *Aberdeen, N.*

Burmah—The Chief Boshway, 1093

Franco-Chinese Commercial Treaty—Prohibition of Opium Traffic between Tonquin and China, 1184

Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 213, 865

Iddesleigh, Earl of (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Bulgaria — Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1710, 1711

Illingworth, Mr. A., *Bradford, W.*
- Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 590
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 323, 824, 861

India—Under Secretary of State (*see* Gorst, Sir J. E.)

India (*Questions*)
- *Administration of India—A Royal Commission*, Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 7, 1474
- *Annual Migration of the Provincial Governments to Hill Stations*, Questions, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 24, 375; *Aug* 26, 547
  - *Transfer of the Seat of Government to Simla*, Question, Mr. James Maclean; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 9, 1751
- *Indian Officials in Private Firms—Sir Donald Stewart*, Question, General Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 2, 1083
- *Liabilities of Trustees—Indian Guaranteed Railway Shares*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 9, 1750
- *Telegraph Department—Grievances of Officers*, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 23, 271
- *The Forest Service—Pensions*, Question, Sir Richard Temple; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 31, 888

Bombay
- *Case of Mr. A. Morton, Public Works Department*, Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 26, 536
- *The Sirdar Prithi Rao*, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) *Aug* 30, 771

Madras
- *Official Scandals*, Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 2, 1070
- *The Land Union in Tanjore — Land Tax in Madras*, Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 9, 1745
- *The late Princess of Tanjore*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 2, 1070

India—*cont.*

Finance, &c.
- *Import Duty on Cotton Goods*, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Jennings, Mr. Addison; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Sept* 7, 1470
- *The Depreciation of Silver*, Question, Mr. Samuel Smith; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 27, 663

Ireland (*Questions*)
- *Asylums for the Poor—Monaghan Asylum*, Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1730
- *Commissioners of Irish Lights—Attendance of Lightkeepers at Divine Service*, Question, Mr. Johnston; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 26, 558
- *Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Country Fairs*, Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1465
- *Customs Service—Port of Belfast*, Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 2, 1067
- *Distress in the West—Mr. Tuke's Report*, Question, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 548
- *Dublin Port—Dues on Fishing Boats*, Questions, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 24, 372; *Sept* 2, 1082
  - *The Great Eastern Steamship*, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 2, 1066
- *Government of Ireland—Law Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant*, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 20, 164
- *Income Tax—Overcharge, Edenagee, Co. Fermanagh*, Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 9, 1754
- *Irish Church Act—Relief of Glebe Purchasers*, Questions, Mr. M. J. Kenny, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1068
- *Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 1883 and 1885—Scheme for Cottages in Macroom Union*, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 546
  - *The Donaghmore Union Schemes*, Question, Mr. William Macdonald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1748
- *Seeds (Ireland) Act—Repayments*, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 532
- *Statistics of Population, Cork Co.*, Questions, Mr. Donal Sullivan, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 533

[*cont.* [*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

The Kingstown "Bird's Nest"—Detention of Children, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 9, 1724

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)

Compounding Debtors, Question, Mr. M. Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 2, 1078

Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee, Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 23, 260; Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 31, 886

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)

Castlebar Dispensary, Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1175

Ely Dispensary, Co. Fermanagh, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 883; Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1464

Glengariffe Dispensary, Question, Mr. E. Harrington; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1461

Inchigeelagh Dispensary — Medical Relief, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 894

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)

Assistant Revising Barristers, Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Clancy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 26, 530

List of Voters—North Leitrim, Question, Mr. Conway; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1179

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act, 1885—Expenses of Preparing Lists—Payment of Officials—Mountbellew Union, Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1475

Revision Court at Ramelton, Co. Donegal, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 7, 1473

Sittings of Courts of Revision, Co. Monaghan, Questions, Mr. Patrick O'Brien; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 6, 1320;—*Co. Tyrone*, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 6, 1319

[See title *Representation of the People Act*, 1884]

IRELAND (SOUTH-WEST DISTRICT)

Sir Redvers Buller, Questions, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 270; Question, Mr. E. R. Russell; Answer, The

[*cont.*

IRELAND (*South-West District*)—cont.

Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 24, 375; *Aug* 26, 564; Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Dillon; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 27, 666; Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes); Question, Mr. E. Harrington; [no reply] *Aug* 30, 793

Clare, Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1076

Stabling for Horses, Question, Mr. J. O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 897

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)

Loan for a National School, Miltown Malbay, Question, Mr. Dwyer Gray; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 2, 1081

EDUCATION (IRELAND)

Board of Intermediate Education, Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 537

Board of National Education — Dismissal of Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1086;—*Resignation of Dr. Newell*, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1086

National Education—Irish-Speaking Districts, Questions, Mr. W. A. Macdonald, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1477

National School Teachers (Ireland) Act—Condition of Teachers, Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1459

FISHERIES (IRELAND)

Fishery Commissioners—Trawling, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 30, 795

The Commission on Scotch Fisheries—Trawling in Galway Bay, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1180

The Herring Fisheries on the South Coast, Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 538

SEA AND COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)

Loans to Fishermen, Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 887

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)

Drainage of Lough Erne, Questions, Mr. Jordan; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 30, 784; *Sept* 7, 1477

[*cont.*

IRELAND — *Inland Navigation and Drainage*—cont.

The Drainage of the Bann, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 543;—*The Lower Bann*, Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 889

The River Barrow, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 264

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)

District Asylums—Salary of Officials, Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1743

Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum, Questions, Mr. Lalor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 274; *Sept* 7, 1471

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)

The East Pier of Kingstown, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 31, 882

Unexpended Grants, Question, Mr. Clancy; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 9, 1736

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)

Culdaff Salmon Fishery Pier, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 30, 786; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1746

POOR LAW (IRELAND)

Bantry Board of Guardians, Questions, Mr. Gilhooly; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach); Question, Mr. Healy [no reply] *Sept* 2, 1062

Cork Union—Stowaways from Liverpool, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1173

Newry Union—Poor Rate for the Camlough Division, Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1178

Unsanitary Condition of the Rathdown Union Workhouse, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 24, 372

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)

Arrangements in Co. Meath, Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 9, 1732

Limerick Post Office—Salaries of the Letter Carriers and Clerks, Question, Mr. Henry Gill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 27, 659

Postal Facilities at Kinsale, Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 9, 1737

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Post Office*—cont.

Telegraphic Department — Miss B. Duffy, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 31, 887

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)

Girvan and Portpatrick Railway, Question, Mr. Hugh Elliot; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 6, 1321

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)

A Convict Depôt, Taylor's Hill, Co. Galway, Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 1, 990

Administration of Justice, Observations, Mr. Tuite; Reply, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach); short debate thereon *Sept* 9, 1774

The Barbavilla Conspiracy, Observations, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Speaker *Sept* 9, 1756

The Crossmaglen Conspiracy—Release of the Conspirators, Questions, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1172

Alleged Assault on Dr. D'Alton, of Branmore, Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 9, 1735

Conviction at Millstreet Petty Sessions, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 9, 1729

Dublin Commission Court House, Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Aug* 31, 877

Firing at the Person—Case of Denis Murphy, Questions, Mr. Gilhooly, Dr. Tanner, Mr. O'Hea; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 3, 1176

Galway Assizes (Sligo), Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 26, 531

Munster Winter Assizes, Questions, Mr. M. Healy, Mr. E. Harrington; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 2, 1079

The Enniskillen Magistrates—"The Queen v. James Phair," Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 27, 657; *Aug* 31, 891

The Woodford Prisoners (Galway), Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 9, 1752

Trial of the Walkers (Belfast), Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 27, 665

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)

Mr. Gray, of Glenann, Co. Armagh, Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 27, 656

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*The Magistracy—cont.*
Mr. Molony, R.M., Co. Mayo, Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1080
Mr. Sinclair, Newry, Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 27, 656
The Cork Magistrates, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 895

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY
Deductions from Pensions, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1081
Employment at Evictions, Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 276
Head Constable Magee, Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 30, 775
Inspectors under the Explosives Act, Question, Mr. William Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1738
Numbers and Religious Composition of the Force, Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1094; Questions, Colonel Sandys, Mr. Hooper; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1458
The Force in Belfast, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1726
Constabulary Force at Millstreet, Co. Cork, Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 545
The Veterinary Surgeonship, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 6, 1311

PRISONS (IRELAND)
Discipline in Maryborough Gaol, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1090
Outbreak of Fever in Maryborough Gaol, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1089
Re-organization—Increase of Salaries of Officials, Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 7, 1477

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)
Attempted Disturbance at Gilford, Co. Armagh, Question, Mr. Alexander Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 27, 655
Firing at the Person, Derrygonnelly, Co. Fermanagh, Question, Mr. Jordan; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 7, 1461

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Crime and Outrage*—cont.
The Riots at Belfast
Questions, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 557
The Commission of Inquiry—Additional Members, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. John Morley; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 19, 90; *Aug* 20, 165; Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 273
Charges against the Constabulary, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 23, 272;—*Casualties,* Questions, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 882
Constable Malone, Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. M'Cartan; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 6, 1308
Cypher Telegrams, Question, Lord Henry Bruce; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1185
Expenses of the Royal Hospital, Observations, Mr. Sexton; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1772; Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), 1727
Loss of Employment by Catholic Workpeople, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1725
Trial of Prisoners, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 26, 539

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)
At Garrison, Co. Fermanagh, Questions, Mr. William Redmond; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1069
At Gweedore, Co. Donegal, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 23, 265; Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1182
In Kilkenny Co., Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1178
In Wexford Co., Questions, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. T. C. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 26, 555
On Lord Clanricarde's Estate, Woodford, Co. Galway, Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 27, 669; Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 6, 1312;—*County Inspector O'Brien,* Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Aug* 31, 884;—*Action of the Police at Woodford,*

[*cont.*

Ireland—*Evictions*—cont.
Co. Galway, Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Sept* 9, 1735

Employment of Gunboats for Conveyance of Legal Officials, Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 6, 1325
Kildysart Guardians, Co. Clare, Questions, Mr. Jordan, Mr. M. J. Kenny; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1728
The Bantry Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1074

Ireland—Crime and Outrage — The Riots at Belfast—Return of Casualties
Moved, "That there be laid before this House Return of persons killed and wounded in the recent riots at Belfast" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *Sept* 2, 1058; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ireland—Leaseholders
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, all leaseholders in Ireland who at the natural expiration of their leases will come under the Land Act of 1881, or who may be subject to a fluctuation of rent during the term of their lease, should have access to the Land Commissioners for the adjustment of their rents" (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *Sept* 9, 1713; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Isaacs, Mr. L. H., *Newington, Walworth*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1381
Criminal Law—Excessive Sentence—Case of George Parish, 1066

Isaacson, Mr. F. W., *Tower Hamlets, Stepney*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1295

Islands of the South Pacific—see *South Pacific*

Jackson, Mr. W. L. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Leeds, N.*
Civil Service Writers, 1468, 1479
  Report of the Departmental Committee, 257, 1725
Finance, &c.—Imperial Taxation on Real and Personal Property, 778
India—Depreciation of Silver, 663
Inland Revenue—Income Tax upon Married Women, 1461
Ireland—Questions
  Board of Works—Loan for a National School, Miltown Malbay, 1081
  Court of Bankruptcy—Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee, 260
  Customs Service—Port of Belfast, 1067
  Fishery Piers and Harbours—Culdaff Salmon Fishery Pier, 786, 787

Jackson, Mr. W. L.—*cont.*
  Income Tax—Overcharge—Edenagee, Co. Fermanagh, 1754
  Inland Navigation and Drainage—River Barrow, 264;—Lough Erne, 784, 1477
  Law and Justice—Dublin Commission Court House, 878
  Piers and Harbours—East Pier of Kingstown, 882;—Unexpended Grants, 1736
Navy—Pay of Seamen—Loss through Depreciation of Silver, 1734
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—Electric Communication in the House, 1076
  Speaker, Election of a, 10
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 873
Registration of Friendly Societies—The Registrar, 1183
Secret Service (Repeal), Comm. *cl.* 1, 1304, 1306; 3R. 1307
Supply—Civil Service Commission, 1842, 1843, 1844
  House of Commons Offices, 1815
  House of Lords Offices, 1811
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1790

Japan—Concessions to German Traders
Question, Mr. Brooke Robinson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 27, 659

Jennings, Mr. L. L., *Stockport*
Egypt—British Trade with the Soudan, 1085
India (Finance, &c.)—Import Duty on Cotton Goods, 1470
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 316

Johnston, Mr. W., *Belfast, S.*
Ireland — Commissioners of Irish Lights — Attendance of Light Keepers at Divine Service, 558
  Crime and Outrage—The Riots at Belfast, 557
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 204, 228, 229, 429

Jordan, Mr. J., *Clare, W.*
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1453, 1454
  Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1420
  Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1385
Ireland—Questions
  Crime and Outrage—Shooting at the Person, Derrygonnelly, Co. Fermanagh, 1464
  Dispensaries—Ely Dispensary, 1464
  Evictions—Kildysart Guardians, Co. Clare, 1728
  Income Tax—Overcharge—Edenagee, Co. Fermanagh, 1754
  Inland Navigation and Drainage—Lough Erne, 784, 1477
  South-West District—Clare—Sir Redvers Buller, 1076
Navy Estimates — Miscellaneous Services, 1708, 1709
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1257, 1258

[*cont.*

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Right Hon. Sir U. J., *Lancashire, Clitheroe*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 830

KELLY, Mr. B., *Donegal, S.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Administration, 1786
Representation of the People Act, 1884—Unpaid Extra Remuneration, 1078

KENNY, Mr. M. J., *Tyrone, Mid*
Army Estimates—Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1588
  Out-Pensions, 1600
  Retired Pay, &c. 1596, 1597
  War Office, 1592
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1622
Ireland—Evictions—Kildysart Guardians, Co. Clare, 1729
  Irish Church Act—Relief of Glebe Purchasers, 1068
Secret Service (Repeal), Comm. *cl.* 1, 1303; *cl.* 2, 1304
Supply, Res. 1302

KENYON, Hon. G. T., *Denbigh, &c.*
France—Arrest of Mr. Farren, a British Subject, 1751
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Circuit Arrangements—North Wales—Flint Assizes, 1462
Post Office — Postmasterships — The Welsh Language, 541
Wales (North)—Collection of Tithes, 551

KENYON-SLANEY, Lt.-Col. W., *Shropshire, Newport*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1580

KIMBER, Mr. H., *Wandsworth*
Civil Service Clerks and Writers — Report of the Departmental Committee, 1725
Gold and Silver Hall-Marking, 274
Portsmouth and Hayling Railway, Consid. 1062
Richmond Park—Tricycles and Bicycles, 379
Venezuela—Seizure of the Ships "Henrietta" and "Josephine" — Claims of British Subjects, 379

KING, Mr. H. S., *Hull, Central*
China — The Chefoo Convention — Anglo-Chinese Convention, Pekin, 890

KING-HARMAN, Colonel E. R., *Kent, Isle of Thanet*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 91, 760; Report, 1282

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Northampton*
Army — Regimental Bands at Political Meetings and Public Festivals, 370, 1480
  The Force in Burmah — Reinforcements, 266

[*cont.*

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1348, 1349
  Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 1372
India (Finance, &c.)—Import Duty on Cotton Goods, 1470
Metropolis—Dwellings of the Working Classes—Demolitions at Chelsea, 893
Parliament—Business of the House—Bills of Private Members, 166, 167
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 248, 277, 822, 870, 871; Report, 1164; Amendt. 1228
Supply—House of Lords Offices, Amendt. 1793, 1795
  Treasury, &c. Amendt. 1824
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1787, 1789

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Richard Power, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Sexton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 31]

LACAITA, Mr. C. C., *Dundee*
Scotland — Municipal Elections — Corrupt Practices, 1183

LALOR, Mr. R., *Queen's Co., Leix*
Ireland—Lunatic Asylums—Maryborough District Lunatic Asylum, 274, 1471

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill
(*Colonel Saunderson, Mr. T. W. Russell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 22]

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Alexander Blane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Leahy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 30]

LAURIE, Colonel R. P., *Bath*
Army Estimates — Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1375

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES) (*Questions*)
"*Bryce v. Rusden*," Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 30, 791
Circuit Arrangements, North Wales — The Flint Assizes, Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Sept* 7, 1462
Contempt of Court—The Case of Sarah Kedart, Question, Mr. Alfred Thomas; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 24, 368
Conviction of John Cox, Signalman on the Somerset and Dorset Railway, Question, Mr. E. R. Russell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 23, 257

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE (*England and Wales*)—cont.
Irregular Detention at the Middlesex Sessions, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 2, 1038
Street Speaking — Case of John Williams, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 7, 1460

Criminal Law
Excessive Sentence—Case of George Parish, Dartford Petty Sessions, Questions, Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Shirley; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 2, 1066

The Magistracy
The Somerset Magistracy, Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 27, 664

LAWRENCE, Mr. W. F., *Liverpool, Abercromby*
Africa (West Coast)—Kidnapping on the Niger—Native Reprisals, 875
Metropolis (Main Drainage Outfalls) — Pollution of the River Thames, 1741
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 362
Spain—The "Mary Mark" Collision, 1463

LAWSON, Sir W., *Cumberland, Cockermouth*
Local Government Bill — Licences for Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, 161
Parliament — New Writ — Double Return for Belfast Borough (Western Division) and Sligo County (Southern Division), 169
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 731, 734
Parliament — Sessional Orders—Interference of Peers in Elections, 79

LAWSON, Mr. H. L. W., *St. Pancras, W.*
Army (India) — Medical Service — Honorary Commissions, 1731
Metropolis — Parks — Angling in the Ornamental Waters, 262, 263
Railways — Bridge on the North London Line, 1324
Public Health—Rivers Pollution—River Chess, Herts, 779
Trade and Commerce—Commercial Education, 1309

Leaseholders (Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill (*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Thomas Ellis, Mr. Puleston*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 21]

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw, *Bradford, Central*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 701, 703, 705
Supply—House of Commons Offices, 1821, 1822

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, Oswestry*
Metropolis—Temple Bar, 270

LEITRIM, Earl of
Leaseholders (Ireland), Res. 1713, 1718

LETHBRIDGE, Sir R., *Kensington, N.*
India — Administration of India — A Royal Commission, 1474
Annual Removal of the Government to Hill Stations, 375, 547
Post Office — Atlantic Mail Service from Galway, 1091

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Parliament—Business of the House, 1755
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 680
Parliamentary Elections (Ireland)—Assistant Revising Barristers, 530

Life Insurance Companies — Return of Accounts
Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 3, 1190

Linen (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Macartney, Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 24]

LLEWELLYN, Mr. E. H., *Somerset, N.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1347

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—President (*see* RITCHIE, Right Hon. C. T.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—Secretary to (*see* LONG, Mr. W. H.)

Local Government Bill— Licences for Sale of Intoxicating Liquors
Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 20, 161

Local Government Provisional Orders (County Divisions) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 225]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 167)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. John Morley, Mr. Henry H. Fowler*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 261]
Report *; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 8)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 223]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 170)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 237]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 172)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee * *Sept* 6
Report * *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 238]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 190)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 256]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 3)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 262]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 4)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 263]
Report *; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 5)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 269]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 6)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 277]
Report *; read 3° *Aug* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Onslow*) *Aug* 30 (No. 7)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 6
Committee *; Report *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (Highways) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 235]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 168)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee * *Sept* 6
Report * *Sept* 7
Read 3ª * *Sept* 9

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 222]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 189)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 7) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 236]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 169)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Local Taxation—The County Rate—Contributions by Towns having separate Quarter Sessions
Question, Mr. Powell-Williams; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 24, 369

Lockwood, Mr. F., *York*
Trade Marks Act—Registration of "Fancy Words," 543

Locomotives Act, 1878 — *Bye-Laws of Road Trustees*
Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 26, 560

Long, Mr. W. H. (Secretary to the Local Government Board), *Wilts, Devizes*
Poor Law—Homeless Poor of the Metropolis, 1629

Lord Advocate, The (*see* Macdonald, Right Hon. J. H. A.)

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland — Chief Secretary to the (*see* Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-)

Lubbock, Sir J., *London University*
Currency, &c.—The Gold Coinage, 1724
Minister of Education—Report of Commons Committee, 1884, 1733
Public Health — Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's Researches, 535

Lyell, Mr. L., *Orkney and Shetland*
Commissioners of Northern Lights—Want of Lighthouses on the West Coast of Shetland, 880

McCartan, Mr. M., *Down, S.*
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast —Constable Malone, 1308
Prisons — Re-organization — Increase of Salaries of Officials, 1477

Macartney, Mr. J. W. E., *Antrim, S.*
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast —Constable Malone, 1308
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 709, 1135, 1136
Representation of the People Act, 1884—Extra Remuneration to Poor Law Officials, 1179

Macdonald, Right Hon. J. H. A. (Lord Advocate), *Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1297, 1299
Scotland—Questions
County Voters (Scotland) Act—Assessors, 885
Fisheries—Dredging for Mussels in Dornoch Firth, 254
Law and Justice—Arrest of the Crofters at Tiree, 276;—Circuit Courts, 1310
Law and Police—Death by Drowning of Donald Macnab, 1315

McDonald, Mr. P., *Sligo, N.*
Admiralty—Contracts for Pork and Butter, 1068
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1451
Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1413
Ireland—Court of Bankruptcy—Mr. C. H. James, late Official Assignee, 260, 886
Law and Justice — Dublin Commission Court House, 877

McDonald, Mr. P.—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1650, 1651
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 314, 1096

McDonald, Dr. R., *Ross and Cromarty*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 956

Macdonald, Mr. W. A., *Queen's Co., Ossory*
Bulgaria — Alleged Ill-treatment of Prince Alexander, 888
Ireland—Labourers Act—Donaghmore Union Schemes, 1748
National Education—Irish-Speaking Districts, 1477
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 452, 454, 461, 627, 1141; Report, 1302

McLaren, Mr. W. S. B., *Cheshire, Crewe*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 901, 908
Supply—Home Office, 1831

Maclean, Mr. J. M., *Oldham*
India—Transfer of the Seat of Government to Simla, 1751
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 97

Mahony, Mr. P., *Meath, N.*
Army Contracts—Supply of Army Clothing, 535
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 465, 469, 520

Malta — The Dockyards — Employment of Maltese Subjects
Postponement of Question, Earl De La Warr *Sept* 6, 1307; Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) *Sept* 9, 1712

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Leicestershire, E.*
Agricultural Department—The Allotment Returns—Returns for Unions and Parishes instead of by Counties, 1187
Agriculture, Committee on—The Hessian Fly, 160
Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Imports from the Dominion of Canada, 1322
Splenetic Blood Poisoning at Arnesby, Leicestershire, 1468
Swine Fever—Inoculation, 778

[*cont.*

MAPPIN, Sir F. T., *York, W.R., Hallamshire*
Army (Ordnance Department)—Manufacture of Shot and Shell, 1093

MARJORIBANKS, Right Hon. E., *Berwickshire*
Board of Trade—Harbour Loans, 775

Marriage Law (Attendance of Registrars)
Question, Mr. Shirley ; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Aug* 30, 787

MASON, Mr. S., *Lanark, Mid*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 441, 443, 452, 924, 928

MATTHEWS, Right Hon. H. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Birmingham, E.*
Burials (England and Wales)—Churchyard at Bolton-on-Dearne, Yorkshire, 777
Coal Mines — Woodend Colliery Explosion, 259
Criminal Law—Excessive Sentence—Case of George Parish, 1067
Housing of the Working Classes (England) Act, 1885—Site of Coldbath Fields Prison, 1075
Law and Justice—Questions
  Contempt of Court—Case of Sarah Kedart, 369
  Conviction of John Cox, Signalman on the Somerset and Dorset Railway, 258
  Irregular Detention at the Middlesex Sessions, 1088
  Magistracy — The Somerset Magistracy, 664
  Street Speaking—Case of John Williams, 1460
Local Taxation—The County Rate—Contributions by Towns having Separate Quarter Sessions, 370
Metropolis—Questions
  Dwellings of the Working Classes—Demolitions at Chelsea, 893
  Fires—Fire at Millwall, 788
  Main Drainage Outfalls—Pollution of the River Thames, 1741
  Metropolitan Police Force — Summer Clothing, 1740
Railways—Railway Book Stalls — Boycotting of Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet, 1480
Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines—The Report, 1183
Supply—Home Office, 1831, 1835
Tithe Commutation Act, 1886—"The Tithe War in North Wales"—Collection of Tithes, 551, 654, 661
Tithes, Payment of, 794
Truck Acts—Mines and Works in Scotland, 1083, 1768, 1769

Mauritius
Official Dissensions—Sir John Pope Hennessy and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, Questions, Mr. Baden-Powell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor ; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 26, 561 ; Questions, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Dr. Tanner ; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 27, 662 ; Questions, Dr. Tanner ; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies) Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 3, 1189
The Supreme Court—Thomas Wilkinson, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 24, 367

MAYNE, Mr. T., *Tipperary, Mid*
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships Built by Contract, &c. 1698

Mechanics' Institutes—Supply of Parliamentary Reports
Question, Mr. Wright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1722

Medical Acts—Unregistered Medical Practitioners
Questions, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Dr. Tanner ; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 2, 1082

MENZIES, Mr. R. S., *Perthshire, E.*
Locomotives (Scotland) Act, 1878—Bye-Laws of Road Trustees, 560, 878
Scotland—Law and Police—Bye-Laws as to Bicycles and Tricycles, 563

Merchant Shipping—Fishing Boats Acts Amendment—Legislation
Question, Sir Henry Tyler ; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 23, 255

METROPOLIS
Dwellings of the Working Classes—Demolitions at Chelsea, Question, Mr. Labouchere ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 31, 893
Fires—Fire at Millwall, Question, Sir Edward Watkin ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 30, 787
Main Drainage Outfalls—Pollution of the River Thames, Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 9, 1741
Railways—Bridge on the North London Line, Question, Mr. Lawson ; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 6, 1324
Temple Bar, Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton ; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 23, 270
The New Police Offices, Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck ; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 23, 277
The Poor Ratepayers of London, Question, Mr. Pickersgill ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1753

[*cont.*

METROPOLIS—*cont.*
The Parks
Angling in the Ornamental Waters, Questions, Mr. Lawson; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 23, 262
Richmond Park — Tricycles and Bicycles, Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 24, 379

Metropolitan Asylums Board
Accommodation for Imbecile Children, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 30, 792
Representation of the Metropolitan Unions, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 9, 1752
Small-Pox Hospital at Darenth, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 27, 664

Metropolitan Police Force, The—Summer Clothing
Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 9, 1740

Metropolitan Poor Bill
(*Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Howell, Mr. Buxton, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Montagu, Mr. James Rowlands*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Sept* 7 [Bill 44]

MILLTOWN, Earl of
Post Office—Postage of Printed Matter, 1719

Miners' Wages Bill
(*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Clancy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 18]

Mines, Royal Commission on Accidents in —The Report
Question, Mr. Arthur Williams; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 3, 1182

Mining Royalties Bill
(*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Clancy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 4]

MOLLOY, Mr. B. C., *King's Co., Birr*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1365, 1366, 1367
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1481, 1534, 1552
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 868
Supply—Home Office, 1830, 1831

MONTAGU, Mr. S., *Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel*
Currency — Appointment of a Commission, 1319
Postal Union—Payment in French Currency, 1744
Russia—Ill-treatment of an M.P. at Moscow, 263

MORE, Mr. R. J., *Shropshire, Ludlow*
County Voters (Scotland) Act—Assessors, 885

MORLEY, Right Hon. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Ireland—Questions
Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast, 91
Distress in the West—Mr. Tuke's Report, 548
South-West District—Sir Redvers Buller, 270
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. 1226
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 123, 343, 346, 352, 865, 1110, 1111, 1119, 1122

MOUNT-EDGCUMBE, Earl of (Lord Steward of the Household)
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, 770

MUNDELLA, Right Hon. A. J., *Sheffield, Brightside*
Board of Trade — Labour Bureau—Appointment of Mr. Burnett, 553
Law of Trade Marks—The International Industrial Convention, 368

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Leahy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Tuite*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 23 [Bill 32]

MURPHY, Mr. W. M., *Dublin, St. Patrick's*
India (Bombay)—Case of Mr. A. Norton, Public Works Department, 536
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 137

National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.), Mr. Conway, Mr. Joseph Nolan, Mr. Sheehy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 3]

NAVY (*Questions*)
H.M.S. "Impérieuse," Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 20, 162
H.M.S. "Phaeton," Questions, Admiral Field; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 3, 1193

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*

Medals to the Sailors and Naval Officers in the Egyptian and Soudan Campaigns, Question, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 30, 783

Returns of Ships of War, Observations, Sir Edward Reed; Reply, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton); short debate thereon *Sept* 8, 1631

The Mediterranean Squadron, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 27, 658

CONTRACTS

Contracts for Pork and Butter, Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kerry, S.); Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 31, 883; Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Forwood) *Sept* 2, 1068

The Channel Squadron—Butterine, Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, Lord Charles Beresford (A Lord of the Admiralty) *Aug* 31, 876

DOCKYARDS

Discharge of Workmen at Haulbowline, Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) *Aug* 24, 370; *Aug* 26, 546

Works at Haulbowline, Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) *Aug* 31, 881; Questions, Dr. Tanner, Mr. John O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 6, 1318

ORDNANCE

Armour-Piercing Breech-Loading Guns, Questions, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 23, 269; *Aug* 27, 663

Gun Practice at Southsea—Recovery of Shot, Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 31, 893

The 38-ton Guns of H.M.S. "Ajax," Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 20, 163

ADMIRALTY

Access to Confidential Designs of Ships, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 3, 1193

Education of Junior Executive Officers—Admiral Luard's Committee, Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 9, 1749

Engine-Room Artificers, Questions, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 23, 271; *Aug* 26, 560

Freeing of Haslar Bridge, Portsmouth, Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 3, 1186

[*cont.*

NAVY—*Admiralty*—cont.

Mr. W. H. White, Naval Constructor and Controller, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 30, 790

Naval Schoolmasters' Pensions, Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 9, 1754

Pay of Crews on the China Station—Rate of Exchange, Questions, Commander Bethell; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 31, 879; Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 9, 1734

Roman Catholic Chaplains on board Troopships, Questions, Mr. M. Healy; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 3, 1191; *Sept* 6, 1323

State of Europe—Reduction of the Dockyard Establishments, Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 9, 1743

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway, N.*

Army Estimates—Army Reserve Force, 1401, 1409
  Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1424
  Out-Pensions, 1601
  Retired Pay, &c. 1595
  Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1545, 1569
Ireland—Fishery Commissioners—Trawling, 795
  Seeds Act—Repayments, 532
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships Built by Contract, 1690, 1697
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1210
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1240
Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1803
  Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1838, 1839
Town Holdings, Motion for Re-appointment of Select Committee. 249, 250

NOLAN, Mr. J., *Louth, N.*

Army (Ireland)—Cavalry Regiment at Dundalk, 892, 1309
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1454
  Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1391
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1627
Navy Estimates—Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1674
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 976

NORRIS, Mr. E. S., *Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*

Parliament—Committee on Procedure, 159
Trade and Agriculture, Royal Commission on—Foreign Bounties, 781

NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S. (Surveyor General of the Ordnance), *Exeter*
- Army—Questions
  - Army Clothing—Limerick Clothing Factory, 1325
  - Clothing Department—Army Clothing Factory, Pimlico, 1742
  - Contracts—Supply of Army Clothing, 534, 535, 1063
- Army (Ordnance Department)—Questions
  - Cavalry Swords, Pattern 1884, 1072
  - Defective Military Weapons, 269
  - Manufacture of Arms, Ammunition, &c. 166, 1093
  - Small Arms—Swords of the 2nd Dragoon Guards, 1077
  - The New 68-ton Gun, 1091
- Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1439
  - Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1420, 1426, 1428
  - Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1559
  - Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1581
- Navy—Ordnance—Questions
  - Cavalry Saddles, 532
  - Manufacture of Materials of War, 661
  - Manufacture of Nordenfelt Guns at Woolwich, 555
  - The "Collingwood" 42-ton Gun, 255
- Supply, Report, 1605, 1606

Northern Pacific—Occupation of Port Hamilton
- Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 7, 1476

North Sea Fisheries Convention, The—The Protecting Cruisers
- Question, Sir Edward Birkbeck; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 8, 1629

O'BRIEN, Mr. J. F. X., *Mayo, S.*
- Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1380
  - Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1576

O'BRIEN, Mr. P., *Monaghan, N.*
- Ireland—Asylums for the Poor—Monaghan Asylum, 1730
  - Registration of Voters—Sittings of Courts of Revision, Co. Monaghan, 1320, 1321

O'CONNOR, Mr. A., *Donegal, E.*
- Army—Royal Military Asylum—Admission of Soldiers' Children, 266
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 1328
  - Army Reserve Force, 1394
  - Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, 1599
  - Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1438

[*cont.*

O'CONNOR, Mr. A.—*cont.*
  - Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. 1414, 1425, 1428
  - Medical Establishments and Services, 1332
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 1361, 1362
  - Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1589
  - Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1374, 1378, 1383
  - Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1538, 1561
  - War Office, 1591
- Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment, 2R. Bill withdrawn, 1053
- Customs Estimates—Surveyor of the Port of London, 1737, 1738
- Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1764
- Ireland—Questions
  - Evictions—Gweedore, Co. Donegal, 265, 266
  - Fishery Piers and Harbours—Culdaff Salmon Fishery Pier, 786, 787, 1746, 1747
  - Inland Navigation and Drainage—Drainage of the Bann, 543, 544;—River Barrow, 264, 265
  - Irish Church Act—Relief of Glebe Purchasers, 1069
  - National Education—Irish-Speaking Districts, 1478
  - Prisons—Maryborough Gaol, Discipline in, 1090;—Outbreak of Fever in, 1089, 1090
  - Registration of Voters—Revision Court at Ramelton, Co. Donegal, 1473
  - Royal Irish Constabulary—Force in Belfast, 1727
- Navy Estimates—Martial Law, 1705
  - Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1672
  - Medicines and Medical Stores, 1846, 1847
  - Miscellaneous Services, 1709
  - Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c. 1678, 1681, 1683, 1685
  - Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1654, 1656, 1657
- Parliament—Business of the House, 1095, 1480, 1481;—Votes in Supply, 91
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1215
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 614, 830, 863, 873; Report, 1171
- Public Accounts Committee—Secret Service Money, 667
- Secret Service (Repeal), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1305
- Supply—Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade, 1840, 1841
  - Civil Service Commission, 1842, 1843
  - Home Office, 1833, 1837
  - House of Commons Offices, 1813, 1816, 1821, 1823

O'CONNOR, Mr. Alderman J., *Kerry, S.*
- Navy—Contracts—Supplies of Mess Pork, 883
  - Dockyards—Works at Haulbowline, 881

O'CONNOR, Mr. J., *Tipperary, S.*
- Army (Army Clothing)—Limerick Clothing Factory, 1325

[*cont.*

O'CONNOR, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, Amendt. 1428, 1455
Militia Pay and Allowances, 1350
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1375, 1381; Amendt. 1390
Ireland—National School Teachers Act—Condition of Teachers, 1459
South-West District—Sir Redvers Buller—Stabling for Horses, 897
Navy (Dockyards)—Works at Haulbowline, 1318
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1700
Miscellaneous Services, 1709
Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1643, 1649, 1650, 1661, 1664
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 239, 930; Report, 1300
Supply, Report, 1606, 1858

O'CONNOR, Mr. T. P., *Liverpool, Scotland*
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1625
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast—Expenses of the Royal Hospital, 1728
Mauritius—Official Dissensions, 562
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 170, 338, 352, 520, 628, 737, 861; Report, 1268, 1275, 1276
Parliament — Sessional Orders — Interference of Peers at Elections, 82
Supply—House of Commons Offices, 1816, 1822, 1823

O'DOHERTY, Mr. J. E., *Donegal, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 716

O'HANLON, Mr. T., *Cavan, E.*
Army Estimates — Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1394
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 870, 986
Post Office (Ireland) — Arrangements in Co. Meath, 1732
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1793

O'HEA, Mr. P., *Donegal, W.*
Ireland—Evictions—Gweedore, Co. Donegal, 1182
Law and Justice—Shooting at the Person—Case of Denis Murphy, 1177
Navy Estimates—Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, 1666
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 234, 612, 869, 870
Post Office — Telegraph Clerks—Subsistence Allowances, 1064

O'KELLY, Mr. J., *Roscommon, N.*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1392
Ireland (South-West District)—Sir Redvers Buller, 666

ONSLOW, Earl of (Lord in Waiting)
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 22

Open Spaces and Recreation Grounds (Dublin) Bill (*Mr. Murphy, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Timothy Harrington*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 24 [Bill 36]

ORDNANCE — Surveyor General (*see* NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S.)

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1° * *Aug* 19

PAGET, Sir R. H., *Somerset, Wells*
Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Swine Fever—Inoculation, 777
Finance, &c.—Imperial Taxation on Real and Realized Personal Property, 778
Taxation on Personal Property in France, &c. 778
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Commons Arrangements — A Select Committee, 881

Parliament
LORDS—
MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Aug* 5
The Session of Parliament opened by Commission
The Commons directed to proceed to the choice of some proper Person to be their Speaker
ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the First Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom *Aug* 5
The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be printed (No. 10) *Aug* 31
Certificate of the Election of Sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland, delivered, and read *Aug* 5, 3
Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Minutes of Meeting, presented and ordered to lie on the Table *Aug* 19, 21
A Royal Commission, Speaker of the House of Commons, Presented and Approved *Aug* 6, 12

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Aug* 19, 20
The Queen's Speech having been reported by The LORD CHANCELLOR; An Address to HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Earl of ONSLOW (the Motion being seconded by The LORD DE ROS) *Aug* 19, 22; after debate, Address agreed to, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves
HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Aug* 30, 770

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Chairman of Committees — The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Aug* 19

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Aug* 19

Sub-Committee for the Journals — appointed *Aug* 19

Appeal Committee—appointed *Aug* 19

Standing Orders Committee — nominated *Sept* 2; List of the Committee, 1054

Committee of Selection—nominated *Aug* 31; List of the Committee, 874

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills

Ordered, That Standing Order No. 72 be dispensed with in the case of all Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills suspended in the last Session of Parliament *Aug* 31

Parliament—Business of the House, Question, Earl Granville: Answer, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) *Aug* 19, 22

COMMONS—

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Aug* 5, 4

A Book containing a List of the Names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament delivered to Reginald Francis Douce Palgrave, Esquire, by Kenneth Augustus Muir Mackenzie, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Great Britain *Aug* 5, 4

Message from The LORDS COMMISSIONERS

The House went up to the House of Peers; and being returned—The House proceeded to the

Election of a Speaker

The Right Honourable Arthur Wellesley Peel unanimously called to the Chair *Aug* 5, 4

Mr. SPEAKER reported Her Majesty's Approval, and took and subscribed the Oath *Aug* 6, 15

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS; —The House went; and being returned—

Mr. SPEAKER reported, That the Lords Commissioners under the Great Seal for opening and holding this Parliament, had made a Communication to both Houses, which Mr. Speaker read to the House *Aug* 6, 16

Elections—Resolutions *Aug* 6, 16; *Aug* 19, 73

Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means, Notice, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Sept* 3, 1303

Privileges — Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Aug* 19

Public Petitions, Select Committee appointed and nominated *Aug* 24; List of the Committee, 485

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Parliament—Standing Orders, Select Committee nominated *Aug* 26; List of the Committee, 653

Ordered, That the Select Committee do consist of Twelve Members *Aug* 27

Ordered, That Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Cubitt, and Mr. Sclater-Booth be added to the Committee

Ordered, That so much of Standing Order No. 91 as fixes five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the Session, Three be the quorum of the Committee (*Sir John Mowbray*)

Selection—Committee nominated *Aug* 26; List of the Committee, 653

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Nine Members *Aug* 30

Ordered, That Lord Edward Cavendish be discharged

Ordered, That Sir H. H. Vivian and Sir Robert N. Fowler be added to the Committee (*Sir John Mowbray*)

Printing

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House *Aug* 23; List of the Committee, 366

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*)—Committee appointed and nominated *Aug* 26; List of the Committee, 653

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The Queen's Speech having been reported by Mr. SPEAKER; An humble Address thereon moved by Colonel KING-HARMAN (the Motion being seconded by Mr. J. M. MACLEAN) *Aug* 19, 91; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed [Second Night] *Aug* 20, 170; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Third Night] *Aug* 23, 277; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Fourth Night] *Aug* 24, 382

Amendt., at end of last paragraph, add " And humbly to assure Her Majesty that we fear that, owing to the heavy fall in the price of agricultural produce, the greatest difficulty will be experienced in the coming winter by the Irish tenant farmers in the payment of their present rents, and many will be unable to pay these rents. That numerous evictions confiscating the rights vested in the tenants by the Land Act of 1881, causing widespread suffering and endangering the maintenance of social order will be the result. That we deprecate any attempt to transfer the loss likely to arise due to inability to pay the present rents, from the owners of land to the taxpayers of Great Britain and Ireland, by any extension of State-assisted purchase on the

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

basis of rents fixed when prices were higher than they now are" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed [Fifth Night] *Aug* 25, 486; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Sixth Night] *Aug* 26, 602; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Seventh Night] *Aug* 27, 670; after long debate, Question put; A. 181, N. 304; M. 123

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 766

Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. S. Smith*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Eighth Night] *Aug* 30, 797

Amendt. to add, at end of Question "And this House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India" (*Mr. Samuel Smith*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added"

Amendt. proposed to the said proposed Amendt. To leave out all after "Burmah, and" to end of proposed Amendt., add "at learning that the Government have resolved to persevere in their policy of annexation, especially as the native population have, by their active hostility and armed resistance to the invading forces, shown that they have no desire to live under British rule" (*Mr. Cremer*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 201, N. 125; M. 76 (D.L. 4)

Question put, "That the words 'This House humbly expresses its regret at the continuance of the War in Upper Burmah, and the great extension of Military operations occasioned thereby; and humbly represents to Her Majesty that the expenses of the said War should not be borne exclusively by India' be added to the Main Question;" A. 125, N. 199; M. 74

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 858

Main Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Clark*); after short debate, Question put; A. 122, N. 197; M. 75 (D.L. 6)

Main Question again proposed, 870; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Picton*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Main Question again proposed, 873; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. A. Sutherland*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Ninth Night] *Aug* 31, 898

Amendt. at end of last paragraph, add "And this House humbly expresses its regret that the condition of affairs in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland is very unsatisfactory; that the administration of the Law does not possess the confidence of the people; that the Naval Forces are supposed to be required to overawe a portion of the population; and that the greatest and most pressing grievance of the crofters and cottars has not been remedied by the Crofters Act, which has failed to provide for the enlargement of the present inadequate holdings, and the formation of new holdings, where they are urgently required" (*Mr. Esslemont*), Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 203; M. 82

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 987

Main Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sexton*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Tenth Night] *Sept* 1, 991

Amendt. at end of last paragraph, add "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that certain circumstances accountable for the recent outbreak, prolongation, and repeated renewals of riots, raids for plunder, and conflicts with the Forces of the Crown, in Belfast, dictate the necessity for the prompt adoption of special measures for the maintenance of social order there, and that the most imperative and urgent of these measures are, the re-establishment of Her Majesty's authority in the district from which the Constabulary Force has been expelled by the rioters, the limitation of all powers of control over the Forces of the Crown, in times of public emergency, and adjudication upon cases of persons charged with offences against social order, to magistrates directly responsible to Her Majesty's Government, and the increase of the local Constabulary Force to such a strength as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency, until Parliament, on consideration of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, can proceed to the application of adequate permanent measures for the protection of life and property in certain quarters of Belfast" (*Mr. Sexton*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Eleventh Night] *Sept* 2, 1096; after long debate, Question put; A. 127, N. 225; M. 98

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1159

Main Question put, and agreed to

Committee appointed, "to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution;" List of the Committee, 1162

Report of Address brought up, and read 1° *Sept* 2, 1162

Moved, "That the Address be read 2°;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 228; M. 107 (D. L. 9)

Original Question again proposed, 1165; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. James Stuart*); after short debate, Question put; A. 120, N. 223; M. 103 (D. L. 10)

Original Question again proposed, 1169; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Adjourned Debate resumed *Sept* 3, 1228; Question put; Address read 2°

Amendt. to add, at end "And we humbly declare to Your Majesty, that certain language used and published by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in regard to the action which ought to be taken by a certain section of the Irish people, should the Bill for the better Government of Ireland (1886) pass into Law, was calculated to provoke breaches of the Law, and ought to be publicly withdrawn, in view of the preservation of the peace of Ireland" (*Mr. Labouchere*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added"

Amendt. proposed to the proposed Amendt. To leave out from "used," to "calculated," insert "by certain Members of this House, and their participation in Conventions held in Foreign Countries in reference to Irish affairs, have given colour to the allegations which have been publicly made and extensively circulated throughout the United Kingdom that such persons are or have been members or associates of the Fenian Brotherhood of the United States, or of the Irish Republican Brotherhood are" (*Colonel Saunderson*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

Main Question put; A. 119, N. 202; M. 83

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1278

Amendt. at end, add, "We humbly represent to Your Majesty that the pacification of Upper Burmah would be promoted by an independent inquiry into the mode of administering the Law in the Courts of that Country, and humbly pray Your Majesty to cause such inquiry to be made, and the results to be communicated to this House" (*Dr. Cameron*) *Sept* 3, 1280; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Question put; A. 81, N. 192; M. 111 (D. L. 12)

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Address"

Law and Justice (*Scotland*)—*Administration*, Observations, Dr. Clark; Reply, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald); short debate thereon *Sept* 3, 1289

Question put, and agreed to; to be communicated by Privy Councillors

DOUBLE RETURNS

County of Edinburgh (*Midlothian*) *and Borough of Leith*, Letter received by Mr. Speaker from the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, electing to serve for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian) *Aug* 9, 19

Belfast Borough (*Western Division*) *and Sligo County* (*Southern Division*), Motion, Mr. Biggar; Observations, Mr. Speaker; Questions, Mr. Sexton, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Speaker *Aug* 20, 168

THE COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE

Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 20, 159

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 2 (*Adjournment of the House*)

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" *Matter* (*The Appointment of a Military Officer over an extensive District in Ireland*) (*Mr. E. R. Russell*) *Aug* 26, 565; after debate, Question put; A. 146, N. 241; M. 95

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 599

SITTINGS AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Thursday 19th August *Aug* 10

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next (*Mr. Jackson*) *Aug* 20

Resolved, That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Monday next (*Mr. Jackson*) *Aug* 27

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE AND PUBLIC BUSINESS

Notice of Motion, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 19, 89; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Sept* 7, 1480; Question, Mr. C. E. Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 9, 1755;—*Duration of the Session*, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 19, 89;—*Votes in Supply*, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 19, 91;—*Bills of Private Members*, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 20, 166;—*Hours of Commencement*, Observation, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 20, 169;—*Precedence of Government Orders — Motions on Perpetual Pensions and Incidence of the Poor Rate*, Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Pickersgill; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 30, 795;—*The Estimates*, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Sept* 2, 1095

ORDERS OF THE DAY AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Address

Moved, "That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Aug* 24, 381; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion, and To-morrow of the other Orders of the Day (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Aug* 31

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Orders of the Day and Business of the House*—cont.

Moved, "That the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, and all stages of the Appropriation Bill, have precedence of other Orders of the Day and the Notices of Motions on every day on which they may be appointed" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Sept* 3, 1195

Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "in the opinion of this House the state of Ireland is such as to require the proposal of remedial measures by the Government, before the time of the House is appropriated solely to the Business of Supply" (*Mr. Dillon*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to

Ordered, That the Standing Order, No. 21, relating to Notices on going into Committee of Supply on Monday and Thursday be extended to the other days of the week (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Appointment of Officers of this House, Question Mr. Richard Power; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 7, 1474

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER

Electrical Communication in the House, Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 2, 1076

House of Commons Arrangements—A Select Committee, Question, Sir Richard Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 31, 881

Re-opening of Westminster Hall, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 30, 782

Shelter in Palace Yard, Question, Mr. W. Beckett; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 20, 160

Ventilation of the House

Ordered, That the Committee to inquire into the Ventilation of the House be re-appointed *Aug* 23; List of the Committee, 366

Question, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke: Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 26, 554

Parliament — Sessional Orders — Interference of Peers in Elections

Moved, "That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom, for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament" *Aug* 19, 73; after debate, Question put; A. 294, N. 126; M. 168 (D. L. 1)

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

New Peers

Aug 19—The Right Honourable William John Lord Monson, created Viscount Oxenbridge of Burton in the county of Lincoln

Sir Michael Arthur Bass, Baronet, created Baron Burton of Rangemore and of Burton-upon-Trent, both in the county of Stafford

Sir Thomas Brassey, K.C.B., created Baron Brassey of Bulkeley in the county of Chester

Sir Henry Thring, K.C.B., created Baron Thring of Alderhurst in the county of Surrey

Sept 2—The Right Honourable Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., created Viscount Cross of Broughton-in-Furness in the county Palatine of Lancaster

The Right Honourable Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., created Baron Stanley of Preston in the county Palatine of Lancaster

Sat First

Aug 6—The Viscount Melville, after the death of his uncle

The Lord Penrhyn, after the death of his father

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

Aug 6—*For* Paddington (South Division), *v.* Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer

For Bristol (Western Division), *v.* Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

For Birmingham (East Division), *v.* Right honble. Henry Matthews, Secretary of State

For Strand, *v.* Right honble. William Henry Smith, Secretary of State

For South-West Lancashire (Newton Division), *v.* Right honble. Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B., Secretary of State

For Lincoln County (South Lindsey Division), *v.* Right honble. Edward Stanhope, Secretary of State

For Middlesex (Ealing Division), *v.* Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton, First Commissioner to the Admiralty

[cont.

Parliament — Commons — *New Writs Issued*—cont.

For Leicester County (Eastern Division), *v.* Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancashire

For Manchester (Eastern Division), *v.* Right honble. Arthur James Balfour, Secretary for Scotland

For Hampstead, *v.* Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education

For Tower Hamlets (Saint George's Division), *v.* Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie, President of the Local Government Board

For Dublin University, *v.* Right honble. David Robert Plunket, First Commissioner of Works

For Cambridge University, *v.* Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes, Postmaster General

For Isle of Wight, *v.* Sir Richard Everard Webster, Attorney General

For Plymouth, *v.* Edward George Clarke, esquire, Solicitor General

For Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews, *v.* Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald, Lord Advocate of Scotland

For Bute County, *v.* James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire, Solicitor General for Scotland

For Dublin University, *v.* Right honble. Hugh Holmes, Attorney General for Ireland

For Liverpool (Walton Division), *v.* John George Gibson, esquire, Solicitor General for Ireland

For Brighton, *v.* Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott, Judge Advocate General

For Devon County (North East Division), *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Croydon, *v.* Honble. Sidney Herbert, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Wigtown County, *v.* Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet, Commissioner of the Treasury

For Marylebone (East Division), *v.* Captain the honble. Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford, Commissioner of the Admiralty

For Sheffield (Ecclesall Division), *v.* Ellis Ashmead - Bartlett, esquire, Commissioner of the Admiralty

For Down County (West Division), *v.* Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill, Comptroller of Her Majesty's Household

For Middlesex County (Enfield Division), *v.* Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone, Treasurer of Her Majesty's Household

[*cont.*

Parliament — Commons — *New Writs Issued*—cont.

For Lewisham, *v.* Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham, Vice Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household

Aug 9—*For* Leith, *v.* The Right honble. William Ewart Gladstone, who, having been returned for the said Borough of Leith and for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian), hath elected to sit for the County of Edinburgh (Midlothian)

For Staffordshire (Burton Division), *v.* Sir Michael A. Bass, Baronet, Manor of Northstead

Aug 10—*For* North Lancashire (Blackpool Division), *v.* The Right honble. Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, G.C.B., President of the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Plantations

For Northampton County (North Division), *v.* The honble Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley, one of the Grooms in Waiting on Her Majesty

Aug 19 —*For* King's Lynn, *v.* The Right honble. Robert Bourke, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies

New Members Sworn

Aug 19 — Right honble. Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill, commonly called Lord Randolph Churchill, *Paddington (South Division)*

Right honble. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, baronet, *Bristol (West Division)*

Right honble. John James Robert Manners, commonly called Lord John Manners, *Leicester (Eastern Division)*

Right honble. Henry Matthews, *Birmingham (East Division)*

Right honble. William Henry Smith, *Strand*

Right honble. Edward Stanhope, *Lincoln County (South Lindsey Division)*

Right honble. George Francis Hamilton, commonly called Lord George Hamilton, *Middlesex (Ealing Division)*

Right honble. Henry Cecil Raikes, *Cambridge University*

Right Honble. David Robert Plunket, *Dublin University*

Right honble. Charles Thomson Ritchie, *Tower Hamlets (St. George's Division)*

Right honble. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, baronet, *Hampstead*

Sir Richard Everard Webster, *Isle of Wight*

Edward George Clarke, esquire, *Plymouth*

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*New Members Sworn*—cont.
Right honble. Hugh Holmes, *Dublin University*
John George Gibson, esquire, *Liverpool* (*Walton Division*)
Right honble. William Pleydell Bouverie, commonly called Viscount Folkestone, *Middlesex* (*Enfield Division*)
Ellis Ashmead - Bartlett, esquire, *Sheffield* (*Ecclesall Division*)
Right honble. John Hay Athole Macdonald, *Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*
James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, esquire, *Bute County*
Right honble. William Heneage Legge, commonly called Viscount Lewisham, *Lewisham*
Right honble. Arthur James Balfour, *Manchester* (*East Division*)
Right honble. William Thackeray Marriott, *Brighton*
Lieutenant Colonel William Hood Walrond, *Devon County* (*North-East Division*)
Honble. Sidney Herbert, *Croydon*
Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, baronet, *Wigtown County*
Right honble. Arthur William Hill, commonly called Lord Arthur Hill, *Down County* (*West Division*)
Captain Charles William De la Poer Beresford, commonly called Lord Charles Beresford, *Marylebone* (*East Division*)
Honble. Brownlow Henry George Cecil, commonly called Lord Burghley, *Northampton County* (*Northern Division*)
Thomas Wodehouse Leigh, esquire, *South West Lancashire* (*Newton Division*)
Aug 23—Ronald Craufurd Munro Ferguson, esquire, *Leith Burghs*
Sydney Evershed, esquire, *Stafford County* (*Burton Division*)
Aug 26—Sir Matthew White Ridley, baronet, *North Lancashire* (*Blackpool Division*)
Aug 27—Alexander Weston Jarvis, esquire, *Borough of King's Lynn*

Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill (*Mr. Shirley, Mr. Quilter, Mr. Lawrence Gane, Mr. T. W. Russell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 23]

Parliamentary Elections Expenses (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Finucane, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Maurice Healy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 27]

Parliamentary Elections Law Amendment Bill (*Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Picton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 25 [Bill 39]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork*
Parliament—Business of the House—Duration of the Session, 89
Parliament — Business of the House, Motion for the Address, 381
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1220
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 383, 386, 390; Amendt. 403, 405, 406, 408, 450, 760, 989; Report, 1162; Motion for Adjournment, 1163, 1167, 1170, 1237, 1240, 1241, 1242

Patent Office, The — The Committee of Inquiry
Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 2, 1064

PEARCE, Mr. W., *Lanark, Govan*
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1642

PERCY, Lord A., *St. George's, Hanover Square*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1155

Pharmacy Act, 1868 — *Prescriptions by Chemists*
Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 3, 1188

PICKERSGILL, Mr. E. H., *Bethnal Green, S.W.*
Civil Service Writers, 1478
Government of Ireland — Law Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant, 164
Metropolis—Poor Ratepayers of London, 1753
Metropolitan Asylums Board—Questions
  Accommodation for Imbecile Children, 792
  Representation, 1752
  Small-Pox Hospital at Darenth, 664
Parliament — Business of the House—Precedence of Government Orders — Motions on Perpetual Pensions, &c. 796
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 528
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Questions
  Flogging at the Hanwell Pauper Schools, 164
  Homeless Poor of the Metropolis, 1629
  Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1870 —Metropolis Common Poor Fund, 1084; —Quota for Officers' Rations, 1755, 1756;—Rations of Poor Law Officers, 792
  Rations to Officers in the Bethnal Green Union, 1094
  "Vagrants and the Local Government Board," 1472
Post Office—Questions
  "Clerks in Waiting" — "Table Money," 376
  General Post Office—Chief Medical Officer, 1187, 1188
  Telegraph Department — Discharge of a Clerk, 380

PICTON, Mr. J. A., *Leicester*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 652; Motion for Adjournment, 871, 873, 921, 950

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders Bill (*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 201]
l. Read 1^a * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 191)
Read 2^a * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3^a * *Sept* 7

PINKERTON, Mr. J., *Galway*
India (Madras)—Land Union in Tanjore—Land Tax in Madras, 1745
Ireland—Inland Navigation and Drainage—The Lower Bann, 889
Law and Justice—Convict Depôt, Taylor's Hill, Co. Galway, 990;—Galway Assizes (Sligo), 531
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 311, 1133

PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R. (First Commissioner of Works), *Dublin University*
Metropolis—New Police Offices, 277
Parks—Angling in the Ornamental Waters, 262, 263;—Richmond Park—Tricycles and Bicycles, 380
Temple Bar, 270
Palace of Westminster—Questions
Shelter in Palace Yard, 160
Ventilation of the Houses of Parliament, 554
Westminster Hall (Restoration), 268, 269, 782
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 404, 405, 406, 408

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES) (*Questions*)
Flogging at the Hanwell Pauper Schools, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 20, 164
Homeless Poor of the Metropolis, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Long) *Sept* 8, 1629
Launceston Board of Guardians—Education of Children in a Public Elementary School, Question, Mr. Borlase; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 6, 1315
Married Couples in Union Workhouses, Question, Mr. Charles Gray; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 3, 1181
Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1870—*Metropolis Common Poor Fund*, Questions, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Pickersgill; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 2, 1084;—*Rations of Poor Law Officers*, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 30, 792; *Quota for Officers' Rations*, Observations, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Speaker *Sept* 9, 1755

POOR LAW (*England and Wales*)—cont.
Rations to Officers in the Bethnal Green Union, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 2, 1094
"*Vagrants and the Local Government Board*," Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 7, 1472

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Luke Hayden, Mr. E. Harrington, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Connolly*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 1]

Portsmouth and Hayling Railway Bill (*by Order*)
c. Considered *Sept* 2, 1061
Amendts. made; Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended (Queen's Consent signified)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir Charles Forster*); after short debate, Debate adjourned

POST OFFICE (*Questions*)
Acceleration of the Scotch Mails, Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 24, 377
Atlantic Mail Service from Galway, Question, Sir Roper Lethbridge; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 2, 1091
Book Post Parcels, Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 31, 874
"*Clerks in Waiting*"—"*Table Money*," Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 24, 376
Female Clerks, Question, Mr. Baumann; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 26, 559
Friendly and Benefit Societies and Mercantile Firms—Additions to Circulars, and of Headings to Invoices, Questions, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Schwann; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 2, 1087
Postage of Circulars, Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 3, 1179
Postage of Printed Matter, Question, Observations, The Earl of Milltown; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) *Sept* 9, 1719
Postal Union, The — Payment in French Currency, Question, Mr. Samuel Montagu; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 9, 1744
Postmasterships—The Welsh Language, Question, Mr. Kenyon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 26, 541
Savings Banks — The Savings Bank, Hastings, —Double Account, Questions, Major Ross; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 7, 1468
Telephone Companies, Questions, Mr. Dwyer Gray; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 2, 1073

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

POST OFFICE—*cont.*
  The General Post Office—The Chief Medical Officer, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 3, 1187

TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT
  Clerks—Subsistence Allowances, Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 2, 1064
  Discharge of a Clerk, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 24, 380
  Country Telegrams, Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 3, 1186
  Rates for Telegrams to the Continent, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 9, 1720
  Deficient Arrangements at West Ham, Question, Mr. Forrest Fulton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 9, 1740
  Money Orders, Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Aug* 31, 878

POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Wigan*
  Education Department—Schemes of the Charity Commissioners, 1741
  Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1763
  France—Agricultural and Industrial Classes, 877
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 718
  Westminster Hall (Restoration), 268

POWER, Mr. P. J., *Waterford, E.*
  Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1368, 1371
  Ireland—Law and Justice—Administration, 1779, 1780
  Supply—House of Lords Offices, 1811

POWER, Mr. R., *Waterford*
  House of Commons—Appointment of Officers, 1474
  Ireland—Board of National Education—Dismissal of Mr. J. G. Fitzgerald, 1086
    Resignation of Dr. Newell, 1086

PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport*
  Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1501, 1504, 1544, 1572
    Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1580
  Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1641
  Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, &c. 1687, 1691, 1696
    Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1667
    Miscellaneous Services, 1706

PRIME MINISTER (*see* SALISBURY, Marquess of)

Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Molloy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Aug* 20 [Bill 7]

Public Accounts Committee—Secret Service Money
  Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 27, 667 [See *Supply*]

Public Health
  Hydrophobia—Mr. Pasteur's Researches, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 26, 535
  The River Chess, Herts, Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 30, 779 [See *Rivers Pollution*]

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Urray Water) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Read 1°* *Aug* 26 [Bill 279]
  Read 2°* *Aug* 31
  Report*; Considered; read 3° *Sept* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Stanley of Preston*) *Sept* 7 (No. 17)

PULESTON, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
  Currency—The Royal Commission—Names of Members, 1479
  Liabilities of Trustees—Indian Guaranteed Railway Shares, 1750
  Russia—Ill-treatment of an M.P. at Moscow, 263

PYNE, Mr. J. D., *Waterford, W.*
  Army Estimates—Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1591
  Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1791, 1792

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C. (Postmaster General), *Cambridge University*
  House of Commons—Appointment of Officers, 1474
  Post Office (England and Wales)—Questions
    Book Post Parcels, 875
    "Clerks in Waiting"—"Table Money," 376
    Female Clerks, 559
    Friendly and Benefit Societies—Headings to Invoices, 1087
    General Post Office—Chief Medical Officer, 1188
    Postage of Circulars, 1179
    Postal Union—Payment in French Currency, 1744
    Postmasterships—The Welsh Language, 541
    Savings Banks—Savings Bank, Hastings—Double Account, 1469
    Telephone Companies, 1073, 1074
  Post Office—Telegraph Department—Questions
    Country Telegrams, 1186
    Deficient Arrangements at West Ham, 1740
    Rates for Telegrams to the Continent, 1720
    Telegraph Clerks—Discharge of a Clerk, 380;—Subsistence Allowances, 1064
    Telegraphic Money Orders, 878

[*cont.*

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C.—*cont.*
Post Office—Ireland—Questions
Arrangements in Co. Meath, 1732
Atlantic Mail Service from Galway, 1091
Limerick Post Office—Salaries of the Letter Carriers and Clerks, 660
Postal Facilities at Kinsale, 1737
Telegraphic Department—Miss B. Duffy, 888
Post Office—Scotland—Acceleration of the Scotch Mails, 377
Mails in Sutherland, 1071
Supply—House of Commons Offices, 1823

Railway Freights Bill
(*Colonel Nolan*, *Mr. Conybeare*, *Mr. Richard Power*, *Mr. Marum*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 25]

Railway Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Channing*, *Mr. A. Acland*, *Mr. Broadhurst*, *Mr. Fenwick*, *Mr. John Ellis*, *Mr. Charles Parker*, *Mr. Jacoby*, *Mr. Lawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 24 [Bill 37]

RAILWAYS
Mixed Trains—Continuous Brakes, Question, Mr. Webster; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 3, 1177
Accidents—The Penistone Accident—Brakes on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway, Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 7, 1466
Safety Railway Couplings, Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 9, 1750
Charges—The Return, Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 23, 273
Rates—Legislation, Question, Mr. Baden-Powell; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 30, 776
Bookstalls—Boycotting of Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 7, 1480

RANKIN, Mr. J., *Herefordshire, Leominster*
Emigration—Emigrants' Information Bureau, 546

RASCH, Major F. C., *Essex, S.E.*
Army—Ordnance Department—Cavalry Saddles, 532
Cavalry Swords, Pattern 1884, 1072
Army Estimates—Army Reserve Force, 1405
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1556

RATHBONE, Mr. W., *Carnarvonshire, Arfon*
Ireland—Distress in the West—Mr. Tuke's Report, 548

REDMOND, Mr. W. H. K., *Fermanagh, N.*
Ireland—Evictions—Garrison, Co. Fermanagh, 1069, 1070
Wexford Co. 555, 556
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 133, 489, 524, 525, 632, 633, 1138, 1139, 1140

REED, Sir E. J., *Cardiff*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1530, 1531, 1533, 1534, 1547
Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1631, 1639, 1640

Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Legislation
Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 3, 1191

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Mahony*, *Mr. Chance*, *Mr. Maurice Healy*, *Mr. Timothy Harrington*, *Mr. Peter M'Donald*, *Mr. Carew*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 5]

REID, Mr. R. T., *Dumfries, &c.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 871, 872

Representation of the People Act, 1884
Extra Remuneration to Poor Law Officials, Question, Mr. B. Kelly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 2, 1078; Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1179
Kinsale, Questions, Mr. Hooper; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 9, 1733

Returning Officers' Expenses Bill
(*Mr. Picton*, *Mr. Edmund Robertson*, *Mr. Caine*, *Mr. E. R. Russell*, *Mr. Burt*, *Mr. James Stuart*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 8]

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
China—Smuggling in China—The Chefoo Agreement—Clause 9, 1310
Western Pacific, Islands of—H.M.S. "Diamond"—Reprisals on Natives, 1313

RITCHIE, Right Hon. C. T. (President of the Local Government Board) *Tower Hamlets, St. George's*
County Voters (Scotland) Act—Assessors, 885
Metropolitan Asylums Board—Questions
  Accommodation for Imbecile Children, 792
  Representation, 1752
  Small-Pox Hospital at Darenth, 664
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c. 1685
Poor Law—Questions
  Flogging at the Hanwell Pauper Schools, 164
  Launceston Board of Guardians—Education of Children in a Public Elementary School, 1315
  Married Couples in Union Workhouses, 1181
  Metropolis Common Poor Fund, 1084 ;—Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1870 — Rations of Poor Law Officers, 793
  Rations to Officers in the Bethnal Green Union, 1095
  "Vagrants and the Local Government Board," 1472
Public Health—Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's Researches, 536
  Rivers Pollution—River Chess, Herts, 780
Registration of Parliamentary Voters, 1191
Vaccination Acts — Prosecutions — Fees to Clerks of Boards of Guardians, 1471

River Thames, Pollution of the—Main Drainage Outfalls
Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 9, 1741

Rivers Pollution (*River Lea*)
Moved, " That the Select Committee of the last Parliament ' to inquire into and report upon the condition of the River Lea, and to make such recommendations as may appear necessary,' be re-appointed " (*Sir Charles Russell*) *Aug* 20, 249 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

ROBERTSON, Mr. E., *Dundee*
Army—Charges against the Ordnance Department, 256
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1555, 1558
France—Summary Removal of Rev. W. J. Drought, 779
Parliament — Sessional Orders—Interference of Peers at Elections, 86
Scotland—Law and Justice—Circuit Courts, 1310

ROBINSON, Mr. B., *Dudley*
Japan—Concessions to German Traders, 659

ROLLIT, Sir A. K., *Islington, S.*
Post Office—Friendly and Benefit Societies—Headings to Invoices, 1087
Registration of Friendly Societies—The Registrar, 1183

ROSS, Mr. A. H., *Maidstone*
Post Office (Savings Banks)—The Savings Bank, Hastings — Double Account, 1468, 1469

ROWLANDS, Mr. J., *Finsbury, E.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England) Act, 1885—Site of Coldbath Fields Prison, 1075
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 854

RUSSELL, Sir C., *Hackney, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 638, 641, 649
Rivers Pollution (River Lea), Motion for Re-appointment of Select Committee, 249

RUSSELL, Mr. E. R., *Glasgow, Bridgeton*
Ireland (South-West District)—Sir Redvers Buller, 270, 375, 564
Law and Justice—Conviction of John Cox, Signalman on the Somerset and Dorset Railway, 257
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 565

RUSSELL, Mr. T. W., *Tyrone, S.*
Army (India)—Indian Medical Service, 1173
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1452
China and Burmah—Trade in Opium, 1743
Customs Service—Port of Belfast, 1067
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1627
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast —Loss of Employment by Catholic Workpeople, 1726
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 461, 465, 1031, 1034, 1035, 1118

Russia—Ill-treatment of an M.P. at Moscow
Questions, Mr. Puleston ; Answers, Mr. Montagu, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 23, 263 [See *Asiatic Russia*]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) Bill
(*Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Acland, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Bickford-Smith*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 12]

Sale under Legal Process Bill
(*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Handel Cossham, Mr. Howorth, Mr. William Hunter*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Sept* 1 [Bill 43]

SALISBURY, Marquess of (Prime Minister)
India (Bombay) — The Sirdar Prithi Rao, 773
Parliament—Business of the House, 22
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 55
Post Office — Postage of Printed Matter, 1719

SALT, Mr. T., *Stafford*
Australia (Western) — Discoveries of Gold, 1749
Education (Grants to Schools), Res. 1763

SANDYS, Colonel T. M., *Lancashire, S. W., Bootle*
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Numbers and Religious Composition, 1458

SAUNDERSON, Colonel E. J., *Armagh, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 525, 526, 744, 1099, 1102, 1105, 1108, 1109, 1111; Report, 1234, 1237, 1240; Amendt. 1241, 1245, 1257, 1261

SCHWANN, Mr. C. E., *Manchester, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 721
Post Office—Friendly and Benefit Societies—Headings to Invoices, 1087
South Pacific, Islands of the—New Hebrides—The Convention with France, 1878, 1088

SCLATER-BOOTH, Right Hon. G., *Hants, Basingstoke*
Supply—Home Office, 1837

SCOTLAND—Secretary for, &c. (*see* BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J.)

SCOTLAND (*Questions*)
Agricultural Leases—A Commission of Inquiry, Questions, Mr. Esslemont; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 30, 788
Commissioners of Northern Lights— Want of Lighthouses on the West Coast of Shetland, Question, Mr. Lyell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 31, 880
County Voters (Scotland) Act — Assessors, Question, Mr. More; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie); Observations, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Aug* 31, 885
Crofters Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1884—*Extension of Act*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 30, 789
Locomotives Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1878—*Bye-Laws of Road Trustees (Forfarshire)*, Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 31, 878
Municipal Elections — Corrupt Practices — Legislation, Question, Mr. Lacaita; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Sept* 3, 1183

SCOTLAND—*cont.*
Truck Acts, The—Mines and Works in Scotland, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Sept* 2, 1083; Observations, Mr. Bradlaugh; Reply, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews); short debate thereon *Sept* 9, 1764
The Easdale Slate Company, Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Aug* 20, 161

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)
Dredging for Mussels in Dornoch Firth, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Aug* 23, 254
Loans to Fishermen in Crofting Parishes, Question, Mr. Angus Sutherland; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Sept* 7, 1476
The Royal Commission — Trawling in Galway Bay, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Sept* 3, 1180

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)
Beam-Trawling in the Moray Firth, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Sept* 2, 1084
Memorial of Fishery Officers, Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Sept* 2, 1071
Report for 1885 — *Fishermen's Houses*, Question, Mr. Duff; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Sept* 7, 1473

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)
Arrest of the Crofters at Tiree, Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Aug* 23, 276
Circuit Courts, Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Sept* 6, 1310

LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND)
Bye-Laws as to Bicycles and Tricycles, Question, Mr. Menzies; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 26, 563
Death by Drowning of Donald Macnab, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Sept* 6, 1313

POST OFFICE (SCOTLAND)
Mails in Sutherland, Question, Mr. Macdonald Cameron; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Sept* 2, 1071
Postal Communication to the Outer Hebrides, Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 31, 889

Secret Service (Repeal) Bill
(*Mr. Jackson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Akers-Douglas*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 30 [Bill 41]
Read 2° * *Sept* 2
Committee; Report; read 3° *Sept* 3, 1303
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Salisbury*) *Sept* 6 (No. 15)

[*cont.*

Select Vestries
l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª *Aug* 19

Sellar, Mr. A. C., *Lanarkshire, Partick*
Post Office (Scotland)—Postal Communication to the Outer Hebrides, 889

Selwyn, Captain C. W., *Cambridge, Wisbeach*
Army Estimates—Military Education, Establishments for, 1583
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1506
Inland Revenue—Income Tax upon Married Women, 1461

Seton-Karr, Mr. H., *St. Helen's*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 714

Sexton, Mr. T., *Belfast, W., & Sligo, S.*
Army Estimates, 1327
Bulgaria — Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1327
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, Motion for Leave, 484; 2R. 1456, 1457, 1607, 1616, 1628
Ireland—Questions
Belfast Main Drainage, 874
Crime and Outrage — Barbavilla Conspiracy, 1757
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry Bill, 797, 897
National Education—Irish-Speaking Districts, 1478
Royal Irish Constabulary—Force in Belfast, 1726, 1727; — The Veterinary Surgeonship, 1311
South-West District—Sir Redvers Buller, 271
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—The Riots at Belfast—Questions
90, 557
Charges against the Irish Constabulary, 272;—Casualties of the, 883
Expenses of the Royal Hospital, 1727, 1728, 1772, 1774
Loss of Employment by Catholic Workpeople, 1725, 1726
The Commission, 165, 166, 273
Navy Estimates — Miscellaneous Services, 1847
Parliament—Business of the House—Motion for the Address, 382
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 575
Parliament—New Writ—Double Return for Belfast Borough (Western Division) and Sligo County (Southern Division), 168
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 195, 482, 627; Motion for Adjournment, 651, 652, 671, 680, 683, 693, 694, 866, 989; Amendt. 991, 1022, 1023, 1027, 1030, 1047, 1105, 1108, 1110, 1152
[*cont.*

Sexton, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Supply—Exchequer and Audit Department, 1846
Report, 1856, 1859
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1839, 1840
Supply, Res. 1303
Wales (North)—Collection of Tithes, 551

Sheehy, Mr. D., *Galway, S.*
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1450
Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1385
Ireland—Questions
Evictions—Lord Clanricarde's Estate, Co. Galway, 1312;—Woodford, Co. Galway — County Inspector O'Brien, 884;—Action of the Police, 1735
Law and Justice—Alleged Assault on Dr. D'Alton, of Branmore, 1735;—Woodford Prisoners (Galway), 1752
Royal Irish Constabulary—Employment at Evictions, 270
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 211

Shirley, Mr. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster*
Army (Ordnance Department) — Army and Navy Guns, 1730
Burials (England and Wales)—Churchyard at Bolton-on-Dearne, Yorkshire, 777
Criminal Law—Excessive Sentence—Case of George Parish, 1066
Fiscal Laws—Duties on Imported Manufactures, 369
Marriages (Attendance of Registrars), 787
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 313
Post Office—Telegraphic Money Orders, 878

Shop Hours Regulation Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Macnaghten*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 26 [Bill 40]

Simon, Sir J., *Dewsbury*
Army—Mr. Gustenberg, Lieutenant, 20th Hussars, 1095
West Indies—Island of Jamaica — Alleged Depredations by a Spanish Man of War, 275, 380

Sites for Churches, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Thomas Mayne, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Crilly*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 6]

Smith, Right Hon. W. H. (Secretary of State for War), *Strand, Westminster*
Army—Questions
Age Retirement, 542
"Apprehended Disturbances in England," 544
[*cont.*

SMITH, Right Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
  Canteens, 655
  Commissions in the Royal Artillery and Engineers, 255
  High Officials in Private Firms, 1175
  Ireland—Canteens, 1072;—Cavalry Regiment at Dundalk, 892, 1310
  Medical Department — Annual Reports, 1065
  Mr. Gustenberg, Lieutenant, 20th Hussars, 1095
  Quartermasters, 1728
  Regimental Bands at Political Meetings and Public Festivals, 370, 1480
  Royal Military Asylum — Admission of Soldiers' Children, 266
  7th Hussars—Suicide of a Sergeant, 1311
 Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Questions
  Cavan Militia—Captain Somerset Maxwell, 261;—Colonel Dease—Major Kerr, 261;—Lieutenant W. H. Malcolmson, 260
  Militia Training—Instruction for Militia Regiments, 1460
  Volunteers, Payment to, in Camp, 1750;—Sergeant Instructors to Volunteer Corps, 1732; — The Capitation Grant, 257, 1186
 Army (Ordnance Department)—Questions
  Ammunition—Cartridges, 1746
  Army and Navy Guns, 1730
  Artillery—Complaints as to Quality of Field or Mountain Guns, 158
  Charges against the Ordnance Department, 159, 256, 373, 374, 563, 1322
  Colonel Hope's Gun, 1464
  Heavy Guns, 783
  Ordnance Committee—Calculated Bursting Strain of Guns, 1754
  The "Collingwood" 42-ton Gun, 1078;—Report on the, 896
 Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 1328
  Army Reserve Force, 1394, 1406, 1409
  Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1454
  Medical Establishments and Services, 1331, 1333, 1339, 1340, 1341
  Militia Pay and Allowances, 1359, 1362, 1363, 1365, 1366, 1369, 1370, 1371, 1372
  Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1589, 1590, 1591
  Retired Pay, &c. 1597
  Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1374, 1377, 1390
  Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1530, 1533, 1534, 1538, 1545, 1551, 1558, 1576
  Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1582
 Egypt—Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops at Assouan, 1739
 Ireland (South-West District)—Sir Redvers Buller, 666, 667
 Parliament—Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means, 1303
 Supply, Res. 1302, 1303
 Supply, Report, 1603, 1604, 1857

SMITH, Mr. S., *Flintshire*
 India—Depreciation of Silver, 663
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. 797

Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Bill
(*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Deasy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 20 [Bill 16]

South Pacific, Islands of the
 Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal"—Reprisals on Natives, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 6, 1313
 Reported Annexation of the Ellice Islands, Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 23, 268
 The New Hebrides — The Convention with France, 1878, Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 2, 1088

Spain
 Fernando Po—Expulsion of the Rev. William Welford, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 877
 The Commercial Tariff — "Certificates of Origin," Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 891
 The "Mary Mark" Collision, Question, Mr. W. F. Lawrence; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Sept* 7, 1463

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL), *Warwick and Leamington*
 Church of England—The Tithe War in Wales, 254
 Ireland—Questions
  Belfast Main Drainage, 874
  Crime and Outrage—Barbavilla Conspiracy, 1756, 1757
  Evictions—Wexford Co. 556
  Law and Justice—Administration, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1779, 1780, 1785, 1786
 Navy—Returns of Ships of War, 1641
 Parliament—Business of the House, 1481
  Speaker, Election of a, 8, 10, 12, 13
 Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1215
 Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2, (Adjournment of the House), 584, 596
 Parliament—New Writ—Double Return for Belfast Borough (Western Division) and Sligo County (Southern Division), 168, 169
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 223, 386, 413, 414, 429, 442, 452, 460, 465, 517, 518, 524, 525, 526, 611, 612, 614, 620, 621, 625, 627, 680, 683, 693, 698, 699, 703, 705, 734, 737, 738, 827, 847, 861, 868, 869, 870, 871, 908, 910, 911, 919, 920, 928, 937, 938, 939, 943, 982, 983, 984, 985, 987, 1034, 1101, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1136, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1155, 1156, 1157;

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*
Report, 1162, 1163, 1164, 1165, 1170, 1171, 1240, 1241, 1243, 1248, 1255, 1258, 1274, 1276, 1289, 1290, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1299
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Metropolitan Common Fund—Quota for Officers' Rations, 1755, 1756
Portsmouth and Hayling Railway, Consid. 1062
Supply, Report, 1604
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1789, 1792, 1793

STANHOPE, Right Hon. E. (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Lincolnshire, Horncastle*
Africa (South)—Pondoland—The Pondos, 784
Australasian Colonies—Queensland—Division of the Colony, 790
Australia—Western Australia—Discoveries of Gold, 1749 ;—Treatment of Natives, 1092
British North American Provinces—The Confederation—Nova Scotia, 1723
Cyprus—The Annual Tribute, 541
Emigration—Emigrants' Information Bureau, 546
England and the Colonies — Imperial Federation—A Joint Committee, 1182
Fiji—Decrease of Population and Trade, 267
Law and Justice—" Bryce *v.* Rusden," 791
Mauritius—Official Dissensions, 561, 562, 663, 1189, 1190
  Thomas Wilkinson, 367
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 866
South Pacific, Islands of—New Hebrides—Convention with France, 1878, 1089
  Reported Annexation of the Ellice Islands, 268
West India Islands—Dominica, 657
  Jamaica — Alleged Depredations by a Spanish Man-of-War, 275, 381
West Indian Colonies—A Royal Commission, 540
West Indian Colonies and the United States—A Commercial Treaty, 1722

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
India (Bombay)—The Sirdar Prithi Rao, 771

STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL, Lord
Bulgaria, Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1711

STUART, Mr. J., *Shoreditch, Hoxton*
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1586, 1587, 1588
Burmah—Military Expedition—The Cost, 547
Ireland (South-West District)—Sir Redvers Buller, 666
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1211
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 221, 223, 513 ; Report, Motion for Adjournment, 1166

Submarine Telegraph Act (1885) Amendment Bill
(*Baron Henry De Worms, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Sept* 9 [Bill 45]

Sugar Bounties (Abolition) — An International Conference
Question, Mr. Tomlinson ; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Sept* 2, 1063

SULLIVAN, Right Hon. T. D. (Lord Mayor of Dublin), *Dublin, College Green*
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast—Constabulary (Casualties), 882
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 726, 1050 ; Report, 1244, 1245, 1248

SULLIVAN, Mr. D., *Westmeath, S.*
Ireland — Statistics of Population — Cork Co. 533

SUMMERS, Mr. W., *Huddersfield*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 836

Supply
Moved, "That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty" (*The Secretary of State for War, Mr. W. H. Smith*) *Sept* 3, 1302 ; Motion agreed to [Estimates referred]

SUPPLY
Considered in Committee *Sept* 6, 1328—ARMY ESTIMATES, Votes 2 to 9 and 11
Resolutions reported, and, after short debate, agreed to *Sept* 7, 1602
Considered in Committee *Sept* 7, 1481—ARMY ESTIMATES, Votes 12 to 25
Resolutions reported *Sept* 8, 1709
First Resolution postponed ; Subsequent Resolutions agreed to
Postponed Resolution considered, and, after debate, agreed to *Sept* 9, 1855
Considered in Committee *Sept* 8, 1643—NAVY ESTIMATES, Votes 7 to 10 and 13
Resolutions reported *Sept* 9
Considered in Committee *Sept* 9, 1793—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 21, 22 ; CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS, Votes 1 to 12 ; NAVY ESTIMATES, Votes 12, 13, 14
Resolutions reported *Sept* 10

SUTHERLAND, Mr. A., *Sutherland*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 873, 964, 965
Scotland — Fisheries—Loans to Fishermen in Crofting Parishes, 1476

SWINBURNE, Sir J., *Staffordshire, Lichfield*
Army Estimates—War Office, 1592, 1595
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 841

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*
France — Summary Removal of Rev. W. J. Drought, 779

Tanner, Dr. C., *Cork Co., Mid*
Army—Contracts—Supply of Army Clothing, 535
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Cavan Militia—Captain Somerset Maxwell, 261;—Colonel Dease—Major Kerr, 261
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1455
  Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. Amendt. 1421, 1428
  Medical Establishments and Services, 1333, 1340, 1342
  Military Education, Establishments for, 1583
  Military Pay and Allowances, 1353, 1359, 1363, 1369, 1370, 1372
  Miscellaneous Effective Services, 1588, 1589, 1591
  Retired Pay, &c. 1598
  Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1378, 1386
  Works, Buildings, &c. at Home and Abroad, 1578, 1582
Bulgaria—Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 549
  Revolution, 378
Disturbances at Belfast Inquiry, 2R. 1456
Ireland—Questions
  Dispensary Districts—The Inchigeelagh Dispensary District—Medical Relief, 894
  Labourers Acts, 1883 and 1885—Scheme for Cottages in Macroom Union, 546
  Law and Justice—Shooting at the Person—Case of Denis Murphy, 1177;—Conviction at Millstreet Petty Sessions, 1729
  Magistracy—Cork Magistrates, 895
  State of Ireland—Constabulary Force at Millstreet, Co. Cork, 545
Mauritius—Official Dissensions—Sir John Pope Hennessy and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, 662, 1189, 1190
Medical Acts—Unregistered Medical Practitioners, 1082
Navy—Dockyards—Discharge of Workmen at Haulbowline, 370, 372, 546;—Works at Haulbowline, 1318
Navy Estimates—Machinery and Ships built by Contract, 1702
  Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, 1667, 1668, 1673, 1674, 1675
  Miscellaneous Services, 1848, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1855
  Naval Stores for Building and Repairing the Fleet, &c. 1678, 1682, 1685, 1686
  Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad, Amendt. 1651, 1659, 1660, 1663, 1666
Northern Pacific—Occupation of Port Hamilton, 1476
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 465, 698, 825, 827, 935, 937, 1034; Report, 1164
Supply—Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade, 1842
  Report, 1602, 1604
  Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Motion for reporting Progress, 1839, 1840
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1792

Tapling, Mr. T. K., *Leicestershire, Harborough*
Contagious Diseases (Animals)—Splenetic Blood Poisoning at Arnesby, Leicestershire, 1467

Temple, Sir R., *Worcester, Evesham*
Asiatic Russia—The Free Port of Batoum, 548
Australasian Colonies—Queensland—Division of the Colony, 790
Bulgaria—Reported Abdication of Prince Alexander, 549, 670;—Message of Prince Alexander to the Czar, 1195
India—The Forest Service—Pensions, 888

Thomas, Mr. A., *Glamorgan, E.*
Law and Justice—Contempt of Court—Case of Sarah Kedart, 368

Tithe Commutation Act, 1836
Collection of Tithes, Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Kenyon; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews); Question, Mr. Sexton [no reply] *Aug* 26, 551
"*The Tithe War in North Wales*," Notice of Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard *Aug* 23, 254; Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 27, 654
Distraint for Tithe—Llanarmon Parish, Question, Mr. Thomas Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 27, 660
Payment of Tithes—Legislation, Question, Mr. H. R. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Aug* 30, 794

Tomlinson, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances, 1376
Patent Office—The Committee of Inquiry, 1064
Post Office—Book Post Parcels, 874
Sugar Bounties (Abolition)—An International Conference, 1063
Supply—Home Office, 1832
Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department, 1793

Town Holdings
Moved, "That the Select Committee of last Parliament be re-appointed to inquire into the terms of occupation and the compensation for improvements possessed by the occupiers of town houses and holdings in Great Britain and Ireland; and to inquire into the expediency of giving to leaseholders facilities for the purchase of the fee simple of their property; and also into the question of imposing a direct assessment on the owners of ground rents, and on the owners of increased values imparted to land by building operations, or other improvements" (*Colonel Nolan*) *Aug* 20, 249; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Trade and Agriculture, Royal Commission on—Foreign Bounties
Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 30, 781

Trade and Commerce—Commercial Education
Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir Henry Holland) *Sept* 6, 1309

Trade Marks
False Marking and Wrapping—Legislation, Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 30, 784
Law of Trade Marks—The International Industrial Convention, Questions, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Mundella; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 24, 368
Trade Marks Act—Registration of "Fancy Words," Question, Mr. Lockwood; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 26, 543

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill (*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2°; read 3° *Aug* 26 [Bill 195]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Waldegrave*) *Aug* 30 (No. 192)
Read 2ª * *Sept* 2
Committee *; Report *Sept* 6
Read 3ª * *Sept* 7

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 208]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Sept* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*L. Stanley of Preston*) *Sept* 7 (No. 18)

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Mundella*)
c. Read 1° *; read 2° *Aug* 26 [Bill 213]
Report *; Considered; read 3° *Sept* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*L. Stanley of Preston*) *Sept* 7 (No. 19)

TREASURY—First Lord (*see* SALISBURY, Marquess of)

TREASURY—Financial Secretary to (*see* JACKSON, Mr. W. L.)

TREASURY—Secretary to (*see* DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS-)

Treaty of Berlin—Article LIX.—Batoum
Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 31, 896

Trust Funds (Railways) Bill
(*Mr. Carew, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Cobb*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 30 [Bill 42]

TUITE, Mr. J., *Westmeath, N.*
Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, 1339
Militia Pay and Allowances, 1352
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Barbavilla Conspiracy, 1756
Law and Justice—Administration, 1774
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 726

Turkey—Disturbances in Armenia (*Van*)
Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 26, 539

TYLER, Sir H. W., *Great Yarmouth*
Army—Questions
Age Retirement, 541
Commissions in the Royal Artillery and Engineers, 255
Ordnance Committee—Calculated Bursting Strain of Guns, 1753
Ordnance Department—Heavy Guns, 783
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1547
Bulgaria—Abdication of Prince Alexander, 1327, 1748
Burmah—Inundation of Mandalay, 542
Inland Revenue—Repayment of Income Tax, 782
Merchant Shipping—Fishing Boats Acts Amendment, 255
Navy—Ordnance—The "Collingwood" 42-ton Gun, 254
Westminster Hall (Restoration), 269, 782

United Kingdom and the Colonies—Imperial Federation—A Joint Committee
Question, Sir Samuel Wilson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 3, 1182

United States—See *Canada*

Universities (*Scotland*) *Bill*
Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 26, 554

University Education (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Commins, Dr. Fox*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Aug* 23 [Bill 33]

Vaccination Acts—Prosecutions—Fees to Clerks of Board of Guardians
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Sept* 7, 1471

Venezuela
Seizure of the Ships "Henrietta" and "Josephine"—Claims of British Subjects, Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 24, 379

[*cont.*

Venezuela—cont.
Trade with the United States, Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Aug* 30, 790

VINCENT, Mr. C. E. H., *Sheffield, Central*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Sergeant Instructors to Volunteer Corps, 1732
Army (Ordnance Department) — Manufacture of Materials of War, 661
Army Estimates—Retired Pay, &c. 1597
Law of Trade Marks—False Wrapping and Marking, 784
The International Industrial Convention, 368
South-Eastern Europe—Contemplated Partition, 1475

WADDY, Mr. S. D., *Lincolnshire, Brigg*
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 585

Wales, The "Tithe War" in—see *Tithe Commutation Act*

WAR DEPARTMENT—Secretary of State (*see* SMITH, Right Hon. W. H.)

WAR DEPARTMENT—Under Secretary of State (*see* HARRIS, Lord)

WAR DEPARTMENT—Financial Secretary to (*see* BRODRICK, Hon. W. St. J. F.)

War Department—see *Army*

WARING, Colonel T., *Down, N.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 1347, 1349, 1350, 1353
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 611, 612, 1121, 1122; Report, 1242

WATKIN, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Fires (Metropolis)—Fire at Millwall, 787

WATT, Mr. H., *Glasgow, Camlachie*
Scotland—Law and Justice—Arrest of the Crofters at Tiree, 276
Venezuela—Trade with the United States, 790

WAYS AND MEANS
Inland Revenue
Income Tax upon Married Women, Question, Captain Selwyn; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Sept* 7, 1461
Repayment of Income Tax, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 30, 782
The Fiscal Laws—Duties on Imported Manufactures, Question, Mr. Shirley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) *Aug* 24, 369

WAYS AND MEANS
Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Sept* 3

WEBSTER, Sir R. E. (Attorney General), *Isle of Wight*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1556
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Circuit Arrangements, North Wales — Flint Assizes, 1462
Marriages (Attendance of Registrars), 787

WEBSTER, Mr. R. G., *St. Pancras, E.*
Egypt—Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops at Assouan, 1739
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, 1248, 1254, 1255, 1296
Railways—Mixed Trains—Continuous Brakes, 1177

Western Pacific, Islands of the—H.M.S. "Diamond"—Reprisals on Natives
Questions, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Richard; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Sept* 6, 1313

West Indian Colonies, The
A Royal Commission, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 26, 540
West Indian Colonies and the United States—A Commercial Treaty, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Sept* 9, 1722

West India Islands
Dominica, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 27, 656
Jamaica—Alleged Depredations by a Spanish Man-of-War, Question, Sir John Simon; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 24, 380

Westminster Hall (Restoration)
Questions, Mr. F. S. Powell, Sir Henry Tyler; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 23, 268

WILLIAMS, Mr. A. J., *Glamorgan, S.*
Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines, Report, 1182

WILLIAMS, Mr. P. J., *Birmingham, S.*
Local Taxation—The County Rate—Contributions by Towns having separate Quarter Sessions, 369

Wilson, Sir S., *Portsmouth*
England and the Colonies—Imperial Federation—A Joint Committee, 1182
Navy—Naval Schoolmasters' Pensions, 1754
Navy—Admiralty—Questions
Freeing of Haslar Bridge, Portsmouth, 1186
Gun Practice at Southsea—Recovery of Shot, 893
State of Europe—Reduction of the Dockyard Establishments, 1743

Wilson, Mr. H. J., *York, W.R., Holmfirth*
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 586

Wolmer, Viscount, *Hants, Petersfield*
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — The Volunteers —Capitation Grant, 257

Women's Suffrage Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Denman*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Aug* 31 (No. 12)
2R. negatived, after short debate *Sept* 2, 1054

Woodall, Mr. W., *Hanley*
Army (Ordnance Department)—High Officials in Private Firms, 1175
[*cont.*

Woodall, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, 1447, 1453
Warlike Stores, &c., Manufacture and Repair of, 1508, 1512, 1523

Woods and Forests, Department of—Administration of the Department
Observations, Mr. Labouchere ; Reply, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) ; short debate thereon *Sept* 9, 1787

Works—First Commissioner (*see* Plunket, Right Hon. D. R.)

Wright, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.W., Leigh*
Mechanics' Institutes—Supply of Parliamentary Reports, 1722

Yeo, Mr. F. A., *Glamorgan, Gower*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 620, 625

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A., *Chester*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 703

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK AND SON, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV

UL 12 JUL 1990